Criminal Law 17
Law of State 29 Penn

Socrates death 36
Jesus executed 39.

ZKH
Spencer

THE STRUGGLE

FOR

RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL LIBERTY.

By THEO. C. SPENCER.

Every effect must have a cause; and, as every man is subject to these effects, he has the right to make use of his reasoning faculties in finding the cause.

NEW YORK:
THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY,
28 Lafayette Place.

[c 1887]

DEDICATION.

To the working men and women, who are justly entitled to receive from their employers a suitable reward for their faithful labor;—

To the philanthropic men and women who are earnestly endeavoring to better the condition of their fellow-creatures—mentally, morally, socially, and financially;—

To all persons who are content with the approval of their own consciences as the reward of their honest efforts to be good themselves and to do good to others;—

This book is respectfully dedicated, by

THE AUTHOR AND HIS ASSOCIATES.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE.

If there is any one thing in the history of the human race that stands out more prominently than another, it is the fact that in this history, from first to last, there is one continued serios of wars, in which the contest is either for conquest of territory and greater individual liberty, or the establishment or defense of some religion.

With reasonable human beings, there must be some cause for this.

This contest and struggle having lasted so many centuries, we venture to enter upon the search for the cause.

Whether we have found the true one or not the reader must judge; but before doing so, we hope that he will examine the history herein made use of, and see if we have erred as to material facts of history; then, if he find we are mistaken in the conclusion to which we have honestly arrived, we earnestly request that he will correct our errors, and make the same honest effort, and give us the result of his labors.

The correct solution of this question is important; and in this age of progressive knowledge, important

to the world that it be truthfully determined, and determined now.

We do not believe that any man has the right to wantonly attack any religious faith and belief unless he is able to supply a better one to take its place.

Man is said to be a religious being: at all events it is natural for him to try and pierce the veil, and form some reasonable conception of the great Unknown; and his present faith and belief, whatever it is, should be respected.

No rude hand should ever be raised to dash from the lips of another that which refreshes and satisfies his yearning heart, without being ready to tender him something which is more refreshing and satisfying, mounting upward and filling his highest aspirations.

If this discussion shall in any way unsettle and endanger the honest faith and belief of any one, we here pledge ourselves to tender them, without delay, a philosophy of life that is reasonable, consistent, elevating, and consoling — thus bringing peace and joy into this life, and leading ever onward and upward into the freshness of the great future.

THE AUTHOR AND HIS ASSOCIATES.

THE STRUGGLE

FOR

RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL LIBERTY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

Could we, as unprejudiced spectators, stand upon some lofty mountain-top overlooking the long valley of human life, and view the successive nations of all ages as they pass before us, what would we behold?

We would see that far back in the dim and distant past, beyond the reach of any authentic history, down through all succeeding generations, there was a constant warfare raging — men slaughtering their fellow-men, crimsoning the ages with a broad line of human blood.

Seeing before us all the suffering, torture, and misery of human beings, would lead us to inquire into and search for the hidden cause of this constant and deadly struggle.

Our most natural and orderly way of solving this question, and the one most likely to lead us in time to its solution, would be to first notice all the changes that took place and note the tendency of them.

The result of this first effort would lead us to find that the changes were all in one direction, and that

the struggle along the whole line was in relation to two questions which created all the difference of opinion between the contending parties. That one of them was a struggle of the people to free themselves from the arbitrary oppression of their kings and political rulers—the people claiming that the powers and privileges exercised by their kings and rulers over them were in fact the people's natural rights to govern themselves, which they were able to do wisely and justly, without the suppression of the rights of any man or class of men.

We would find that the people were gradually obtaining some of their rights, and, when once secured, they did not part with them again. With this fact before us, we would have no difficulty in finding that all of these changes were tending to deprive the kings and rulers of some of their powers and prerogatives, and vesting them where they rightfully belonged—in the people.

We would find, at the same time, that the other question was one that ever kept pace with the political, and having the same tendency, namely, that there were a few men in the world claiming for themselves the position of God's messengers to and agents of the people as apostles, saints, and inspired writers; and also that God's will and commands to his people could only come through them.

While another class of men claimed they only could rightly interpret what these agents and inspired writers brought to the world, thus making a vast army of cardinals, bishops, priests, preachers, and teachers—all demanding from the people reverence, obedience, and support.

The struggle of the people was to get some relief and freedom by dispensing with the services of this class of men, to find their own way to God, to determine his will to them, and to live according to that will as they understood it.

The general tendency in dealing with these subjects of dispute is similar or identical, it being to give the people greater political power and greater religious freedom to govern themselves and learn God's will for themselves, without any dictation from these sanctimonious, intermeddling sycophants.

In following two straight lines a great distance, and finding that they continually approach each other, we would know that they must, if followed far enough, at last come together. So in following the tendency of these two questions, we will in time find, as a mathematical certainty, they will meet—a result we can as readily arrive at as we solve any other question.

This result could not be reached and positively determined by observation; but by following the contest down to the present time we would have no hesitation in determining the result, which we would find to be full and perfect political and religious liberty, wherein the people alone would be the sovereign and the head of the government, and every man left free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and to "do unto others as he would that others should do unto him."

It would be seen that in the past all the power and authority of the nation were vested in one person —an absolute monarch, with dictatorial powers.

This absolute monarch sat upon his throne by

divine right, and as an immortal ruler over his subjects, for they then had the same political dogma that exists today—that the king can never die. This king was the law, and his will was supreme in the control and government of his subjects. He claimed that within himself was the royal conscience which determined what was right and what was wrong, and whose mandates his subjects were bound to obey. Not only must his royal revenue be paid, but he required his subjects to submit to his will and be guided by his conscience; and they must pay homage to him as their sovereign master, and kneel and humbly pray when asking for any favor, privilege, or right.

In looking back into the distant past we would see a king ruling over a people who humbly looked up to him for protection when assaulted by an invading enemy—a ruler who held over them his rod to smite all who neglected or refused to obey his will and conscience. More than this, he could deprive them of their property, forfeit their lands, banish or imprison them, and at his own caprice or pleasure even take human life.

In looking forward we would see that succeeding generations, as they passed on, were ever struggling to throw off some of these oppressive and unjust burdens and demands, until finally in their efforts they were in a measure successful by gaining some political right or having some abuse restrained, thus diminishing and restricting the unlimited powers of the sovereign.

For many centuries we would see a constant struggle going on, in which the people were striving

to force their sovereigns to surrender to them some right or power which was unjustly withheld from them. In these constant struggles we would see the earth made red with the blood of her people.

As we look further on we see the people rising in their might and manhood and demanding of the king some of their natural rights, and then enforcing their demand by wrenching them from him. Here we would see that the people had so far succeeded that they changed the absolute monarchy to a limited one, in which the king's powers were greatly lessened and restrained.

We would notice that, even in this modified government, the people continued the same old struggle to obtain further political rights, in which victories would be followed by defeats; the heads of tyrannical kings falling under the ax of the public executioner; kings mounting the throne to take the places made vacant by those who were forced to retire into banishment disgraced—all this by the will and power of a determined and resolute people. In England we would see King John signing the Magna Charta—the Great Charter of Liberty—restraining the royal prerogative, relieving many grievances of the people, and guaranteeing to them the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property, unless declared forfeited by the judgment of their peers or the laws of the land; the throne made vacant by a Revolution, to be followed by a Commonwealth, which, on gaining sufficient authority, becomes a despotic government under the rule and control of religious fanaticism, until the people, exhausted and weary of the strife, placed a king again upon the throne. William and Mary,

before ascending the throne made vacant by the abdication of James, we find assenting to the declaration of rights, in which it was solemnly guaranteed that Protestant subjects might bear arms for their defense; that elections of members of Parliament should be free to all; that freedom of speech in Parliament should not be questioned in any place out of Parliament; that excessive bail should not be required; and that cruel or unnatural punishments should not be imposed.

We would see in the New World of the West sturdy, earnest men and women who had been driven from their homes in the Old World by their religious and political persecutors, to seek homes in the wild forests where they might enjoy equal rights with all others in the political government of the country, and, what to them was the dearest of all privileges, the right to worship God according to the dictates of their *own* conscience, and not the conscience of a haughty king or pope.

From this review of the political history, is it not apparent, if not beyond question, that, as a historical fact, the political changes, from first to last, have all been in one direction?—from unlimited political power and authority, vested in one person, toward an individual freedom, in which the political power and authority are surrendered to the people, making the head of the government their obedient servant; placed there, and only remaining there, subject to their sovereign will.

This must impress itself as an undoubted truth upon the mind of every thoughtful person who is able to analyze events, and separate causes from

results, and then group them together as a whole in order to determine the general law by which all political changes are guided and controlled.

When the law is discovered and determined, and applied to all known and well-established facts in the history of the world, then, by inference and logical reasoning, this line can be extended back and beyond recorded facts.

In every department of scientific research, in every field of thought explored by logical reason, when the investigation and search is to find some cause lying beyond known and ascertained facts, or beyond the bounds of actual experience, this method is now universally adopted, as it has proved to be a correct and a safe one.

Wherever any general law exists, it is found to be constant, uniform, and invariable.

Whenever it is found that this law is producing successive results, disclosing a certain uniform direction or tendency, and, knowing that its action and results will continue the same although beyond the bounds of experience, by following the general tendency under this law which governs, we can follow it with perfect confidence, knowing from experience that it will most certainly and surely lead us not only to find and determine the hidden cause in the distant past, but to forecast the result in the distant future.

The longer the line of successive events supported by ascertained facts, either from observation or reliable history, the more certainly does the investigator determine the action of a general law, with the cause and final result.

Herschel had confidence in this method when searching for a planet which lay beyond the reach of all telescopes, and hidden in the depths of the boundless blue, as he "threw his grapple into space, and felt the influence of an unseen planet trembling along the delicate line of his analysis."

If we see, through this method of reasoning, the constant and unerring tendency, down to the present time, it will show us the origin of political power and authority; from which we may safely enter upon the investigation of the tendency of religious belief, from the advent of Christianity to the present time, as well as determine the cause—the original conception—and the final result of all religion.

If we can do this by comparing the changes we know to have taken place in the Christian religion with the changes in political affairs, which we have found to keep pace the one with the other, we may, with greater confidence, if not certainty, arrive at a natural, rational, and reasonable solution of the subject of religion, which has been so long enveloped in myths, miracles, visions, and dreams; with unaccountable seraphs and angels, impossible dragons and devils; a heaven of eternal rest for the chosen few, and eternal unrest and torment for the many; with discord, hate, revenge, contention, persecution, and a continual series of bloody wars for so many centuries.

If this can be solved and fully understood, is it not time, after more than eighteen centuries of constant struggle, that men of science, and thoughtful, earnest philosophers, should give this subject their attention? They should give it that careful consider-

ation which they are now giving other subjects, and investigate it in the same way, by applying to it the same tests and the close and rigid scrutiny which they make use of in all other investigations.

They would soon find, as Humboldt did, that "this universe is governed by Law," and that there is no such thing as the supernatural—which is nothing but unnatural—in this universe of unerring and ever-acting Natural Law.

Such men, if they would turn their attention to this subject and give it careful sifting, analyzing all its elements, throwing out the visionary and vapid constituents, would be able to unravel this snarl of inconsistencies. Then by placing it in the crucible of reason, burn out the dross, and see if there is any pure metal in it. Thus they could bring it down out of the clouds and mists of superstition into the domain of Natural Law, Natural Causes, Natural Results, and Natural Common Sense. When they once do this, ordinary people can see it, understand it, and fully estimate its merits or demerits, its truth or falsity.

Then, either to accept it if they can and *live* it, or denounce it openly and fearlessly as a falsehood and cheat that has been a curse to the human race long enough, and must now sink into the obscurity of mother Paganism, to sleep "that sleep which knows no waking."

Is it not time that discussion and investigation should be taken from those who are holding it as a divine prerogative—those who make it an exclusive profession of their own, as a means of subsistence, profit, and power?

Should it not go into the hands of those who will

not demand reverence for their priestly robes and pretended absolutions, while at the same time their lackeys are demanding offerings and tithes from the credulous and priestridden people — into the hands of those who are diffusing practical knowledge, and doing the people practical good from love of the knowledge diffused, and love for the truth — neither asking nor expecting any pecuniary return for their labors — not laboring for scarlet robes nor jeweled crowns, to awe and frighten the ignorant and timid?

Is it not time this veil of sanctity which has been so long and closely wrapped around this subject and everything connected with it, to keep out the penetrating light of reason, should be torn away?

Reader, *you* know this is one of the most vital of questions — far, far above all others, and one in which every human being is directly interested. It is a subject which we have tried to investigate as best we could without any partisan feelings, and prior to this investigation had no preconceived opinion on the subject; but, as an impartial investigator, examined the facts of history and followed them through to the present, uncertain as to where they would lead us, or what result we would reach when the facts were placed together and looked upon as a whole.

On finding the political history mixed and interwoven with the religious, in an effort to separate them and place them side by side, they appeared from first to last to be governed by the same general law of progress.

Finding this result, and solving the political question, led to the solution of the religious question.

This made it a natural and reasonable solution

from first to last, without being obliged to resort to the supernatural and mythical.

This is the method and line of reasoning that others are asked to apply to the following historical facts, for the purpose of searching out and bringing this great error to the light.

It is an error which has not only been a scourge to mankind for eighteen centuries, but the cause of that bloody contest in which fifty million human beings have been brutally slaughtered, while a host of others only escaped death to be persecuted and tortured. Who can tell how many more millions have lost their manhood, and lost respect for themselves, by pretending to accept this religion when they loathed and detested it, but chose to live the life of religious hypocrites rather than to be burnt at the stake—a result which in its effect upon the human race has been more disastrous and corrupting than torture or death of these victims.

Let the history of this struggle tell its own story, and have its own effect, each one judging for himself whether the conclusion herein reached is founded upon historical facts, or is only the effect of a disordered imagination.

The priests and preachers may say that it all originates from that "subtle old serpent" who was once cursed, but is not dead yet, as he has been outgeneraling them by having more than ten followers to their one.

"Ah, yes!" they will say, "he has now taken to writing books. This will endanger our business if it is suffered to go on; for as soon as the people know the good from the evil they will choose for themselves

without coming to us, and may find out the secret upon which all religion is built. Let this once take place, let the people commence thinking for themselves, and our Holy Church and all of God's vicegerents will be lost forever!"

In their fright from fear of this "old serpent," as a detective and an author, they will cry out, "Where is Lord Macaulay?—for it requires nothing less than an English lord to answer the arguments of this snake, and prevent him from overturning the church which has supported us for eighteen centuries. We must have Lord Macaulay to defend our church now, for he once said it should 'still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand upon a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.'"

These priests and preachers may say the "old serpent" can make use of good quotations from respectable authors of the present age, but in his diatribe he digs down for what he calls historical facts into the filth of the ignorant past, to find those old slanders against the Holy Church that were refuted long ago by men of God.

These priests may well say "the filth of the past," for so great an error as to be the original cause of so monstrous a scourge to the human race must be concealed deep down in the mire and filth of the past. Still we will make one effort to bring it out into the light, although it may cover us with the rank pollution of its own rottenness.

These priests are ever saying, when the church is attacked, "What will become of the world without

us?" "What can they do without us in the civilization of a new country?"

The brawny farmer may take his all with him to a new country; the ingenious mechanic his machinery; the engineer his plans for railroads and other public improvements; the merchant his goods; but still the priests would say, "all these men are of no account in building up and civilizing a new country." They would claim that it required a few of them to distribute the Bible and religious tracts to build up a new country upon a lasting foundation. Although they may reach the country after the hardest struggle is over, still they are soon able to send back a vivid account showing how zealous missionaries have carried on the glorious work of civilizing the world by redeeming one more benighted spot on the earth, so that the people are, with their Christian help, prosperous and happy!

Reader, as our last personal appeal to you, we still insist that our motives are impartial, our only aim is to do some good by leading at least a few—especially the priestridden Irishmen—to think for themselves upon this question. We ask you to test this subject candidly, seriously, and honestly.

To the working men, who are the bone and sinew of this land, just one earnest word:

What matters it to you whether God is one person or three? If he is good and just, and ready to do what is right in relation to the life of each and every human being, is not this enough for you? What matters it to you whether Christ was a God or only a good man; whether he was made out of nothing, or born the same time as his father; whether the

first woman ate one apple or a peck—as you had nothing whatever to do with it?

This you are told is religious doctrine. Of what practical use is it to a laboring man who is struggling for a bare existence to support himself and family by his daily labor—one who has done no intentional wrong to God or man?

The law of your country has provided for you one day each week for recreation and rest from your toil, but the religious man tells you you must spend the day in a prosy church on a back seat, only to hear that you are surely going the road to perdition, not for your own sins, but for the sins of another.

As a consideration for hearing this news you are expected to contribute something from your hard earnings for the support of the church, and thank God for the blessed privilege of having what you earn without waiting for Providence to answer your prayers.

CHAPTER II.

THE BEGINNING.

The first line in the Holy Scriptures informs us that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

Who it is that tells this is not declared in any part of the book.

How could any human being know this?

We address this question to those who have dared to eat of the fruit of knowledge and common sense, and who have had their eyes opened.

The question, however, hardly requires a formal reply, as it suggests its own answer.

We are told—but not by Moses, who lived long after—that Moses in some way knew this, and made a memorandum of it as an event of some little importance, as it might interest others who could not expect to enjoy the benefit of a personal experience.

Whoever wrote it must have done so many thousands of years after the world was inhabited, and it matters little who it was. In this account of the beginning and creation as well as the history of the world detailed in the Pentateuch, the account itself is inconsistent and unreasonable, and the most im-

portant events are meagerly stated, while events and things of least importance are dwelt upon at great length and minutely described.

The account of the creation of the heavenly bodies is given in these few words: "And God made two great lights: the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. *He made the stars also.*" This is stated to have taken place four days after there was light; for God said upon the first day, "'Let there be light,' and there was light."

How insignificant this account makes our whole solar system appear, by stating that God made the earth, sun, and moon, and the stars also. While our earth is but eight thousand miles in diameter, one of these stars—the planet Jupiter—is 90,250 miles in diameter, saying nothing of the other six planets and their satellites in our solar system, or of the other solar systems in this universe of worlds.

It is claimed that the one who wrote this wrote all that portion of the history of the world found in the Pentateuch, or first five books of the Bible.

In this history many things of little or of no importance are made more prominent than the creation of the whole universe.

This is quite apparent when we look at a few of them—many of them trivial, others ludicrous, and some utterly impossible. This can be seen in the following:—

The building of the ark, which could not have been as large as the Great Eastern, but said to have furnished room for a pair of all the animals in the world, with their food; the description of the building of the tabernacle for the Lord; the building of

Babel (which was not as high as the Washington monument) and the means taken to prevent it being extended upward into heaven; Moses going upon the mountain and getting the ten commandments all written upon two tables of stone, and throwing them down and breaking them in his anger.

These are only a few of the many strange statements found in this history of primitive man; but there are others that sound to us of this age more like blasphemy of God than a sacred account of his personal intercourse with men.

Such an instance occurs where it is stated that the Lord commanded them to kill every male among the little ones; to kill some of the women, and to spare others for something worse than death.

When God is said to have made all the beasts of the field he must then have made that "old serpent" that talked to Eve and told her to learn something, and gain some knowledge of good and evil. It would appear that she made an effort to follow this reasonable advice, and prevailed upon Adam to do the same, but this so angered God that he returned to the earth again and cursed the serpent, the woman, and Adam, for seeking to know the good and the evil, so as to distinguish the one from the other. For this, it is said, God drove the man out of the garden, but the Bible does not tell us how the woman was put out.

All this is said to have been written by Moses, but the way it is told renders it impossible.

Let any one test these five books to find the author, and Moses will be the last one in the world to be charged with writing them.

If we were to find an old letter without any signature, and tried to find out the author, if this letter often spoke of one John Smith, and what he had said and done, and described his death and burial, and what happened after it to this John Smith, who was the meekest man in the world, no sane person would think of charging John Smith with being the writer of the letter. It would be absurd!

Can any reasonable and rational being of the nineteenth century honestly believe that any part of this was written by Moses?

This imaginary Original Sin — for it can be nothing else — is the very "mudsill" of the Christian Religion, for without it there would have been no need of a Redeemer, no occasion for a hell, no occasion for the great struggle which has been going on since the first Christian church was organized.

It is upon this foolish dogma that the whole structure rests.

This simple act of eating an apple is made a monstrous sin — the Original Sin — that can not be atoned for in all eternity.

That there was an object in inventing such a story we hope to make clear in the course of this discussion.

It has all been made what it is by designing men out of the visionary dreams of the old mythologists. These dreams were so terrible and monstrous as to frighten people into looking upon them as real, and this made them the willing dupes and slaves of designing men.

Thousands of men and women have been made raving maniacs by this cruel falsehood, and it is

making them every day in this enlightened age of the world.

Let any man read a page in a book on Mythology, and he will see that this story is but another leaf from the same book.

That which is so strange and so discouraging is the fact that in the nineteenth century—this age of culture and progressive thought—there are so many intelligent men who actually believe this to be a true and—what is worst of all—a sacred and holy account of man's first appearance upon the earth, and of the one act that irrevocably sealed his doom for all eternity.

This is a sad and lamentable fact to reflect upon, and only shows that when the people were as ignorant as they were superstitious their minds were easily influenced by others. The belief in such a monstrosity as Original Sin, and eternal misery on account of it, became a disease of the mind which descended to the offspring as a hereditary evil.

Let us see if the source of this great error can not be discovered by throwing the strong light of reason back into the night of the past, and determine it as we would any other question which required study and thought, and which must be done calmly and without passion or prejudice, with but one object—that of finding the truth—and not for the purpose of injuring any class of men, or building any new religion.

It is not questioned that there was a time in the past when there lived a people who had a strange system of belief, which more enlightened people upon investigation discovered was a system founded upon

myths and mysteries, woven into an intricate system of allegories.

In these allegories they mixed up the fanciful with the real, and formed imaginary gods and impossible devils.

To this system — which to them was an intricate science — they gave the name of Mythology.

In an effort to discover that great error in the dim past, it may be well to find some explanation of how it is that we today have the whole heavens filled with these imaginary gods, beasts, birds, fish, and reptiles, to distinguish the different constellations. We have only to look up to the heavens on a clear night, as these constellations are passing us, to see the traces of the ancient system of mythology.

By the aid of this old science we may be able to explain how it is that so strange an account is found in Genesis of the creation of man, the garden of Eden, the subtle serpent, and the fall of man.

These symbols of the mythologists were in the course of time transformed into the real, and made to represent other persons and things.

The people then, as now, were honest in their belief; but in many things which were sacred truths to them we have found, in the progress of the world, that they were sadly mistaken. May it not be possible that great errors still remain that are misleading the honest people of today?

If all our teachers, for many generations, were interested in sustaining a certain set of dogmas, and the truth as to their real origin was concealed from us, the error upon which these dogmas were founded would remain undiscovered.

The people are honest, for they have never attempted to investigate these so-called sacred dogmas, but have been willing to trust interested men to decide all questions that have arisen. They have looked upon such subjects as sacred, and too intricate for common minds, having had good reason for this, for some of our most intelligent and respectable judges have decided that even to express a doubt as to the literal truth of the Holy Scriptures and the things therein stated is a *crime*, as "Christianity is a part of the common law of our country."

The records of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania still retain in full force such a decision.

The account of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, and their banishment from it, resulting in the downfall of the whole human race, is a story that sounds to many of us—very many of us—like the old nursery tale of Santa Claus leaving his prancing team of reindeers on the housetop while he found his way down the chimney to bring us the welcome toys of Christmas.

Had this story been found in the Holy Scriptures, our learned judges would have decided that to question its literal truth would be a crime. It being a story, however, not wrapped in a veil of sanctity and guarded by interested priests and preachers, it was soon found out; and it was also found, that, unlike the other, it was a beautiful illustration of the principle of goodness and generosity—the Good or God only pictured in an allegory to adapt and bring it to the realization of infant minds, to be more fully understood in our mature years.

We believe the time is not far distant when the

veil of sanctity which has so long covered this account in Genesis will be drawn aside, and people will see that it is an allegory representing principles, and not literal facts.

In searching for the original and true meaning of these strange statements as quoted from the Pentateuch, we naturally turn back and examine the old myths and curious statements, which we do not expect to find anywhere but in works of ancient mythology; and here is a little of what we have found.

MYTHOLOGY.

One of the traditions of the mythologists was that in the beginning a woman and a man, by their disobedience, brought into the world sin and misery.

By this allegory was expressed the astronomical fact that the celestial Virgin (the constellation Virgo) and the Herdsman (the constellation Bootes), by passing below the horizon with the setting sun at the autumnal equinox, delivered the world to the wintry constellation; and seemed, in falling below the horizon, to introduce into the world a genius of evil called Ahriman, the Persian demon or principle of evil, represented by the constellation of the Serpent.

Cardin says the Persians called this constellation of the Serpent "Ophincus," or "the Serpent of Eve."

Perseus cutting off the head of Medusa—that woman once so beautiful—and holding her head in his hand, simply represents the Virgin, whose head sinks below the horizon at the very moment that Perseus rises. The serpents which surround Perseus are Ophincus and the polar Dragon, which then occupy the zenith.

The tradition relates that the woman had decoyed and seduced the man (and "seduce" only means to attract or draw off), and the constellation Virgo (Eve) setting first, seems to draw Bootes (Adam) after her.

Then it is that the woman tempts him by offering him fruit, fair to the sight and good to eat, which is an ear of corn in her left hand, the eating of which would give knowledge of good and evil. The Virgin also holds in her right hand a branch which is an emblem of Autumn, and is so used in the picture of Mithra to divide the summer from the winter, as an open door giving knowledge, or as a key to unlock and find the good and the evil.

This couple, it was said, were driven from the celestial garden, and a cherubim with a flaming sword was placed at the gate to guard it.

As the constellations Virgo and Bootes (Eve and Adam) fall beneath the western horizon, then it is that the constellation Perseus rises in the opposite horizon, holding in his hand the flaming sword, and seeming to drive them from the summer garden, that domain of fruits and flowers.

It was said that the offspring of this Virgin should bruise the head of the serpent, and thus deliver the world from sin.

At the time of the winter solstice, which is the precise time when the Persian magi cast the horoscope of the new year, the sun is on the bosom of the Virgin, or constellation Virgo, which rises with the sun in the eastern horizon.

A Persian picture is referred to which represents a beautiful virgin with flowing hair sitting upon a

chair, with two ears of corn in her hands, and suckling an infant called Horus.

There is said to be another picture in France which represents the twelve signs of the Zodiac, in which the virgin has an infant child by her side.

The sun, in old astrological pictures, was represented by a child suckled by a chaste virgin, and became afterward, at the vernal equinox, the ram or lamb, triumphant over the constellation of The Serpent, or Hydra, as it disappears from the skies.

That the restorer of the divine and celestial nature would in his infancy live abased, humble, obscure, and indigent, became typical, as the western sun is abased below the horizon, and that the first period of his four ages or seasons is a time of obscurity, scarcity, fasting, and want.

In portraying the life of the sun, finishing his course at the winter solstice, when Typhon and the rebel angels gain the dominion and seem to put them to death, it soon after appears that by the sun rising into the vault of heaven, he is, by thus rising, virtually "born again," or "resurrected from the dead," and he then enters the heavens, where he reigns.

This would represent Christ being put to death by the wicked, and gloriously rising again, and ascending from earth to heaven, where he reigns forever.

The whole details of the birth of Christ are represented in this picture.

The stable is represented by the constellations of the Charioteer and the Goat, formerly Capricornus.

There is represented the Ass of Typhon, or the Great Bear, and the Ox or Bull, which are the constant attendants of the manger.

The twelve apostles are the genii of the months, etc.

The Virgin has acted very different parts in the various systems of mythology. She has been the Isis of the Egyptians, in which character she is made to say, in one of their inscriptions, as cited by Julian, "The fruit I brought forth is the sun."

Most of the traits mentioned by Plutarch apply to the Virgin in the same manner as those of Osiris apply to Bootes.

The Virgin has likewise been Ceres, whose mysteries are the same as those of Isis and Mithra.

She has been Diana of Ephesus, the great goddess of Syria; she has been Sibyl, drawn by the lions; Minerva, the mother of Bacchus; Nestora, the chaste virgin taken up into the heavens at the end of the Golden Age; Themis, at whose feet is the Balance that was put in her hands; the Sibyl of Virgil, who descended into hell, or sinks below the horizon, with a branch in her hand.

The same principal stars in the Great Bear represent David's chariot; and the Crown, which is situated behind, formed of ivy, was called Osiris.

This mythological representation of Adam and Eve, the garden, the fruit, the flaming sword, the temptation, the sin and the fall, the virgin, the suckling infant Isis, the serpent whose head should be bruised, thus banishing sin from the world—all these things have a strong resemblance to the story which appeared in Genesis long after, for the science of

mythology was popular with the ancient astrologers of Egypt, Chaldea, and the far East.

It can not be expected that this brief synopsis is a full explanation of the account given in Genesis; but it must be remembered that we have to deal with myths, mysteries, dreams, and visions; and it can not be expected that where these are made use of by succeeding generations that later writers would find it necessary to copy the ancient story, for they all bring into the field the fanciful and visionary, and they could easily change or add to them to any extent required.

Even if the foregoing is not a satisfactory explanation, in all candor we would ask, Is it not consistent and reasonable? This account certainly is as reasonable as the one in Genesis; and as an allegory it is more finished, for in those earlier days—long before Moses was born—people were adepts in the science of mythology.

This brief explanation of mythology, as given in the American edition of Chambers' Encyclopedia, clearly shows to any unprejudiced mind the manner in which the ancient astrologers composed all their figures and fables. They took such constellations as they found at the time on the circle of the horizon, collected the different parts forming groups, expressed them in hieroglyphic characters, and this served the purpose of an almanac.

Such is the secret of all the ancient pictures, and the source of all the mythological monsters; and we think an explanation of the monstrous doctrine of Original Sin and Eternal Damnation, which has caused so much bloodshed in all the past ages.

CHAPTER III.

THE PAGANS AND THE JEWS.

In the theology of some of the Pagans the overruling powers were vested in their many fabulous deities, of which they gave the genealogy, and to which they ascribed the moving causes which governed all human actions, whether good or evil.

Importuning their gods for special favors, and failing to receive an answer to their request, the Pagans would lose all respect for their gods, and in a rage would throw them down and pound them, then drag them through the mud and filth before setting them up again.

Another kind of Pagans had a conception of one God, which, with some, was the sun. With others the sun was only an emblem of him who was at too great a distance to mind the affairs of men. In consequence of this, they conceived the idea of mediators between God and man — these mediators being supernatural beings.

This conception of God, with such assistants, as unreasonable as it appears to every one *now*, was believed in, taught, and defended by such learned and renowned philosophers as Thales, Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato.

Socrates, who was Plato's teacher, was bitterly

opposed by other religious Pagans for teaching and trying to have incorporated into this form of belief a pure system of morals, so that religion should no longer remain barren of all moral principles — without any regard to the duties of man to his fellow-men.

Socrates was not satisfied with that selfish, one-sided religion, without one word of human love, of human sympathy, and human duties to others. There was not, in such a cold religion, enough humanity to satisfy his warm, noble, and generous heart: it was not a religion which could be defined as "that bond and obligation and sense of duty which we feel from the relation in which we stand to some Superior Power."

Socrates wanted something more than this: something nearer, something dearer, something more practical and natural.

He taught the high moral principles that virtue consisted in knowledge, and that to *do right* was the only road to happiness; and, as every man sought to be happy, vice could arise only from ignorance and mistake as to the means, hence the proper correction was an enlarged teaching of the consequences of action. He was persecuted in what was called the "Tyranny of the Thirty," for teaching and trying to have morality made a leading element of religion, and for this he was condemned and suffered death.

The Pagans seemed to have some idea of the necessity of an atonement for their sins, and that without the shedding of blood there was no remission of sins. Sacrifices were therefore deemed necessary, and were required to be of a character commensurate with the dignity of the sinner.

The Pagans in time became bewildered, appalled, and hampered by their many gods, which they had created out of their fear and awe of the forces of Nature, which produced grand and mysterious results, to them incomprehensible, and therefore supernatural.

With them every force of Nature, whether in the bowels of the earth, on its surface, or in the heavens above, had assigned to it a special god. The hidden forces in the earth, as "motion toiling in the gloom," the rumbling thunder and the lightning's flash, were one and all swarming with gods, each ruling supreme in his own sphere, and each having his baser passions of anger, selfishness, pride, and even ungovernable wrath; and all these gods were to them real and sacred.

While the abject servility of the Pagans toward their unreasonable gods would surprise us, the demand for reverence, worship, and praise, as well as the offering up of the innocent as a sacrifice to their gods' inordinate cupidity, would not only astonish us, but fill us with pity toward them for their credulity and ignorance.

Reason at length worked out in the mind of some thoughtful heathen an idea respecting God which even at that time was not wholly new to the world; and he placed upon his altar the inscription, "To the Unknown God."

Prior to this time people had formed the same conception, but as the years rolled on and "god-makers" appeared, the number of gods was increased as necessities seemed to arise for new ones.

We might well ask, How could this thoughtful

heathen know there was a personal God? Monotheism would be the natural result of this line of reasoning; but, at the same time, this would not necessarily lead him to find a *personality*.

His reason taught him that every effect must have a prior cause; and in tracing back from effect to cause, he was of necessity led to the most remote cause of which his mind could conceive as final—the origin of all.

This primal cause was to him the unknown God, and only became to him a personality when he speculated upon the origin of the first man or of the system of worlds.

Here he could conceive of no other way for them to appear unless they were first created, which would require a creator, which he made a personal being.

Among the ancient Jews there was a little cluster of earnest men living in Judea, with whom Christianity stands closely connected—the Essenes.

They were a retired, quiet people, untroubled by the noise of war or strife of parties, leading a life divided between ablutions of the bath and deep contemplation and fervent prayers—despising the body and bodily wants; a people that allegorized and symbolized, and who ever had a longing thirst for knowledge in relation to the hidden mysteries of their *one* God.

One of their principal occupations was the study of God—the study of that unpronounceable name which only the high priest dared utter once a year in the Holy of Holies during the most awful and solemn service on the day of atonement.

The Essenes believed that a knowledge of that

name in four, twelve, and twenty-four letters, would give them the power of prophecy and of receiving the Holy Ghost.

The spiritual influence of the Holy Ghost was to them the direct spirit of God, possessing all knowledge and all power.

A legend existed among them that a king—possessing great purity, knowledge, and power—would appear to rule over them as a nation; and that his coming among them would not be heralded by pomp and display, but that he would appear in their midst in an humble way. This king had been promised them by their prophets.

It is not surprising, therefore, that among such a people, with their habits and peculiar views, there should rise up, as the natural offspring of their virtuous and pious lives, a pure and spotless being, who had been taught by his mother from his earliest infancy that his birth was a miraculous one, and that he was not the child of Joseph.

The Sadducees and the Pharisees were not satisfied that Jesus was their promised king; and as to the pretensions of his mother that his conception and birth were out of the ordinary course of nature, they could not and would not believe.

Jesus announced moral principles and religious doctrines that were opposed to the Jewish religion; but although arrested and taken before a Jewish tribunal, nothing was found against him. The people, however, took him into their custody, and executed him as an impostor, and as one opposed to their religion.

The mob that put Jesus to death was like all other religious fanatics—as soon as any one questioned *their* sacred and holy religion, nothing less than the life of the offender would satisfy them.

It was dangerous to hear this reformer publicly discussing the doctrines of the Jewish religion.

The doctrines he advocated had never been taught in any religion before, but were like the moral teachings of the Pagan philosopher Socrates.

Christ taught the people that there was something *more* required of them than their duties to God and the worship of him; that they had duties and obligations to their fellow-men; that they should love one another, and should do unto others as they would that others should do unto them; that their old and harsh doctrine of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," was not a true doctrine; that such a doctrine proceeded from a feeling of revenge, and the baser passions of men, which should be suppressed, not encouraged.

This was a direct attack upon the old forms of religion, which were the teachings of the inspired writers, and according to the example set them by God, who inflicted punishment to appease his wrath.

While the anger of the people was limited, and their punishment limited, God's punishment for a *trifling* offense was unlimited in its effects upon those who were innocent of any offense. They therefore naturally inferred that God's wrath must be unlimited.

Christ taught them a truer and higher religion than this—a system of pure morals, which, had it been followed and taught by all of his disciples, his

priests and preachers, would have revolutionized the world, putting an end to religious dogmas, and bringing peace and happiness to a priestridden people.

His disciple, St. James, caught the true meaning of the new religious doctrine, expressing it in simplicity and purity when he said that pure and undefiled religion, before God and the Father, is to visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, and to keep themselves unspotted from the world.

In *this* religion we believe, and hope never to say or do anything which will cast the least slur upon it; but as for the harsh and unreasonable dogmas manufactured by cruel, selfish, and bigoted men, we denounce them boldly and fearlessly, and hope to see them dragged out into the open light of day and strangled to death!—buried, never more to rise and torment the people of this world.

This reformer was the purest, sweetest, most lovable being, in his character, his acts, and his daily walk among the oppressed and unfortunate, of any one, without an exception, whose name is mentioned in the history of the human race.

Jesus was truly God-like, simply because he was good-like, and had within him, highly developed and expanded, what every human being has as an undeveloped germ in his nature—a *principle* of goodness, which is nothing more nor less than the signification of the word "good," which gives us the sublime word God!

That we may see at a glance the marked difference between the religion of Christ, as defined by his apostle—which is an eternal principle issuing out of the Great Fountain of Life, and therefore sacred—and

an orthodox dogma made by man, we quote the following words of John Calvin, while speaking of the condition of mankind from the effect of Adam's sin:—

"Every being born of woman comes into the world with his reason and will utterly corrupt, so that by nature he is incapable of knowing and loving God and goodness, but is inclined to pursue evil, and that he is utterly incapable of being good, or doing good to others: on which account the anger of God has subjected him to temporal death, and destined him to eternal punishment in hell."

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

It is an undoubted fact that the apostles—the founders of Christianity—believed themselves gifted with a special mission from on high, and that they could transmit to their successors, by the laying on of hands or by some other form, the right to teach and to preach. Ordination is a primitive dogma in the Christian Church; and from this came an order of priests, as a distinct permanent clergy, invested with peculiar functions, duties, and rights.

It is also unquestionable that at one period in the fifth century the separate societies, or the Christian congregations in different towns, were far more independent of each other than they have been at any subsequent time. Hence arose the Independents, who insisted that the parent body should have no general government, but that each local congregation should be a sovereign society in itself.

This was the condition of the early Christians, who soon, however, gathered so much strength and acquired so much influence that they felt authorized to assume that the State was subordinate to the Church.

The Catholics claim that the foundation of their church took place shortly after the martyrdom of

St. Peter, in the year 67, for they have a tradition that St. Peter had been a Bishop of Rome; and the idea that the Popes were his successors even at that early date strongly possessed the minds of the western Christians.

The time and conditions were opportune for forming a great church, to be the mother of all lesser churches, and wily, shrewd men took advantage of the occasion. Those who founded this church and framed its religious dogmas, framed them not only to suit themselves, but to accord well with the religious views of both the Pagans and the followers of Christ. Christianity was a compromise between religious doctrines, and was made to suit the times. The Fathers effected this independently of their sacred writings, laying out their plans first, and then added to and struck out of their sacred manuscripts—which were voluminous—whatever was necessary to make them harmonize with their creed. They also interpolated passages, putting into the mouths of the old prophets words foretelling the appearance of a Redeemer wherever the writers had spoken of a king that would some day come and rule over Judea. They also produced a new revelation from God, which was bound with their manuscripts in one book, with the word "Holy" on the back of it. They reformed the promises of the old prophets by adding to their statements the words, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet." In this way they attempted to incorporate all of their sacred writings into one, pronouncing it in its entirety holy and sacred truth; and then to protect it as such, as far as possible, they put at the close, as a notice to all

trespassers having the audacity to inquire into their methods, the following: "And if any one shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from all things which are written in this book."

The first point was to make use of Christ, the reformer, who had been crucified, as a martyr for his new religious cause. His birth having been humble and obscure, they could surround it with miraculous events, and have these so described in their sacred writings not yet fully written. The people would know nothing of his life, for it had been spent in Egypt, except some three years just previous to his death. They could therefore safely write it to suit themselves. Then they must make all the scenes of his birth and death miraculous—such as could not occur to any human being. In all this they succeeded to some extent; but not, however, with the intelligent Jews of that day. The Jews expected a king, not a Redeemer, and they denied not only the whole story of Christ's miraculous birth and death, but also that they (the Jews) had anything to do with his crucifixion; and their descendants, from that day to this, have said the same.

The writings of Josephus, in which is given a full history of the Jews during the time of Christ's life, contain not the least allusion to him; but the Bible-makers have issued new editions of Josephus' works, in which they have inserted a paragraph in reference to Christ, wherein Josephus is made not only to speak very highly of him as a most remarkable man, but also make him express a doubt whether it

was "lawful to call him a man." This passage occurs at a place where Josephus was speaking of some great misfortune which had befallen the Jews; and in the sentence immediately following this he speaks of still "*another sad calamity*," the details of which he gives at length. It is between these two sentences that the sacred tinkers have inserted this falsehood! This can be verified by any one who will take the trouble to examine chapter iii, Book IV, "Antiquities of the Jews," as now published, and compare it with the earlier and unaltered editions. If these men were bold enough to perpetrate this forgery upon a book printed and bound, would they hesitate to alter ancient manuscripts, which are not only separate, but neither printed nor bound?

What actually occurred at the time of Christ's alleged conception is something not susceptible of ordinary proof, even if it were a fit subject of inquiry; and certainly we would not expect to find it recorded in history, as the facts could be known only to the mother. His birth, however, with many of the surrounding circumstances, are the legitimate subjects of evidence, although many of these, even, are delicate questions, and would not find a place in the general history of the times. It is certainly a strange account, and one that has a doubtful appearance on its face. The statement as to "the wise men of the East" following an erratic star to the place where the young child was born is not only strange, but involves an impossibility. They saw the star in the *east;* and as Bethlehem is some five miles *south* of Jerusalem — which city they visited that night on their way to Bethlehem — they could not have followed it

toward the *east*, for they were obliged to travel south, which would have left the star on their left. And not only is this unreasonable and impossible, but it is equally impossible, in changing our position on the earth only *five* miles, that the relative position of a star in the heavens should change the breadth of a hair. Five hundred miles would not change its position, especially if the star were moving in a course parallel with our own, and directly ahead of us.

That these men had in their wisdom made up their minds as to what they would witness, and the effect it would have upon them, is quite apparent from their statement, which is as meager as it is meaningless. It is said that, "when they had come into the house [not a stable] they saw the young child with Mary its mother, and fell down and worshiped him." And this before they knew whether he was a king, Redeemer, or only a chance "foundling," whose parentage on the father's side was doubtful. The wise men must have gone there in the hope of finding their promised king, and it would have been natural for them to greet him as such, and not to fall down and worship him as a young God. If they had looked upon this child at that time as the miraculous son of the Holy Ghost, they must have learned of his divine conception from Joseph, and placed the most implicit confidence in his dream—if he told them his dream; or this was but a part of that nicely woven fiction, manufactured by the "Bible-makers," and by them inserted in this account, as their descendants have manufactured and inserted fictions in the works of Josephus; as Joseph Smith has done with the sacred Book of Mormon, and Mahomet with the Koran.

The fraud was committed to establish the divinity of this child, and it was so adroitly done, that, by being closely watched and guarded by those who are interested in the success of this stupendous trick of god-making, it has stood for eighteen centuries.

Had these "wise men" been giving their testimony in a court of law, and had they been asked the direct question, what reason they had for saying this child was the king of Judea, their answer would have been stricken out as soon as the court had learned that some prophet told them so in the words, "And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judea, art not the least among the princes of Judah, for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule my people Israel." Most assuredly this would not be competent testimony to prove that he was a king.

Again, what answer could the wise men give if questioned as to his parentage? They would not be allowed to say what some prophet told them, or that Joseph had told them that he had dreamed that Jesus was the son of the Holy Ghost. The court could not receive this testimony, but Joseph upon taking the stand to explain—if he could—this strange and unaccountable parentage, would be compelled to admit that it was only a *dream*, not supported by the slightest intimation from Mary, who knew all about it, and who, if anything remarkable had happened, would undoubtedly have told her husband. By whom it was, and how it was, that she was found to be with child of the Holy Ghost, are things not disclosed by the record of the event; and the son has nowhere acknowledged the paternity of his alleged father.

If we take the account of Christ's genealogy as it

is given, it would clearly appear that he could not have been the son of Joseph; and is it therefore not a little strange that, in tracing back the lineage of Christ, the lineage of Joseph should be followed back to David?

While Christ is claimed to be the willing sacrifice offered as an atonement for the sin of Adam, or, as Augustine says, "the share which each one of us had in the sin of Adam," the account which we have of his death does not support this assumption. When he found that he was to be executed, it is said that he retired to the garden of Gethsemane, and there, while writhing in great agony, prayed the Father that "the cup might pass from him"; and as he "sweat great drops of blood" he became more resigned to his fate; but afterward, while in the very jaws of death, he was still an *unwilling* victim of this sacrifice, crying out, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?" One of his disciples gives this account of his death: "The veil of the temple was rent in twain, from top to bottom, and the earth did quake, and the rocks were rent, and the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints who slept arose and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."

The "many" who saw them have remained silent in relation to this most astounding and public spectacle, excepting the Jews — and nearly all, if not all, the people in Jerusalem were Jews — who have always denied every word of it. It is quite doubtful whether Matthew ever wrote anything of the kind. Like St. John, he left this part a blank, to be filled up by the Bible-makers at their leisure. How strange

that in the other three gospels no mention is made of these most astonishing events! Is it not reasonable to infer that these men gave a *correct* account of all that actually happened, and that, in interlining, the copyists failed to make Mark and Luke's accounts agree in all respects with Matthew's, and overlooked John's altogether? These statements of the eye-witnesses should be carefully scrutinized; for upon this alone stands the Christian religion!

Here it may be said, and truthfully said, that there was such a person as Christ, and that he was publicly executed as one claiming to be the son of God, while his mother, as well as the Bible-makers, claimed that he was the son of the Holy Ghost. Is it not evident, considering all the circumstances, that the plan of those shrewd men depended upon their being able to make it appear that Christ was the son of either the Holy Ghost or God, and that they did just what Joseph Smith and Mahomet did when in the same business and having the same end to accomplish, that is, recorded a falsehood, and then endorsed it as holy? Think of this a little. Has it the appearance of truth on its face? Or has it the appearance of being false?

As the birth and death of Christ were made factors in the conception, as first entertained, of the Primal Cause of all, and of the personalities of the Godhead, hence it is that every circumstance connected with the birth, life, and death of Christ, is of the most vital importance, for upon his miraculous conception and birth and resurrection from the dead rests the whole theory of his divinity; and upon these rest

also the whole plan of salvation and the hope of every Christian for a life of eternal joys.

Having fabricated Original Sin out of the eating of one apple, something in the line of a miraculous salvation became absolutely necessary to carry out the "grand plan." Having placed the human race in an awkward position, the conspirators decided upon this means of extricating a few, and frightening the rest into paying for an "indulgence," thus bringing in what was most needed—a large revenue to keep up the pomp and splendor of the Christian Church.

This is a fitting time to determine whether or not the birth and resurrection of Christ—by which he became the son of God, the Savior of the world, the Redeemer of mankind—were miraculous.

In the progress of the world, we appear to have reached a point where nothing less than the naked truth, and the *whole* truth, will satisfy the inquiries made by those who seek to solve the mysteries surrounding the birth and death of this great reformer.

The idea of a personal God, unseen and unknown, naturally led men to anticipate some visible expression of his existence, and the notion that appeared to them the most consistent and rational was that this should come through an only son, offered by the Father as an atonement for the original sin of man.

This whole idea they took from heathen mythology. The Virgin, on whose breast the Sun rested, gave them the notion of the Virgin Mary with her son resting on her breast; and when the Virgin says, "The fruit I brought you was the sun," they imagined the Virgin

Mary saying, "The fruit I brought you was the Son of God." The Virgin was to bruise the serpent's head, and thus deliver the world from sin. When they placed the taint of Original Sin upon every being born of woman, they saw the necessity of making Christ immaculate, and it was done; but they overlooked the mother, and left her under original sin. Two different sects of monks discovered the mistake as late as 1140, and, after quarreling over it seven hundred and fourteen years, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was made an article of faith of the Romish Church by a bull promulgated in 1854. As they already believed in ghosts and spirits, they had no difficulty in accepting the Holy Ghost of the Essenes, which was a principle of purity, power, and goodness, which could reach them by its influence, being omnipresent, and still God, or of God. This was a compromise made to attract the Jews, as they had already done with the Pagans.

Having deferred to the superstition of the people in regard to supernatural things, and having borrowed from mythology the leading ideas in their plan, the Christians ventured to follow the example of the Pagans, and make one more God. As they had taken from the garden of the skies (or summer solstice of mythology) the garden of Eden; the subtle serpent from Ophincus, the serpent of Eve; the apple from the fruit that was fair to the sight, and the eating of which would give knowledge of good and evil; Adam from Bootes, and Eve from Virgo; the flaming sword from the sword of Perseus; and the fall of Adam and Eve from the fall of Bootes and Virgo below the horizon; it only remained to make the Virgin's suckling

infant the son of God by changing Horus into Jesus, and the plan was complete.

Thus was built the dogma of a triune God: the Father of all, with his son as a mediator between him and man, and the Holy Ghost as an influence acting upon the *hearts* of men, and thus enabling them to partake of the grace of God. In this pure principle of Power and Goodness combined, to which the Christian God-makers gave the name of Holy Ghost, they stumbled by mere accident upon the God of all other gods—*not* a personality, but more! The conception which they had of God created and nourished within them a desire to come into closer contact with him; for the human heart craves some visible and tangible object of reverence, love, and sympathy. This object was found in the Son of God, who, having suffered, could sympathize with them, and the thought of him, although unseen, was "like feeling in the dark for the hand of a friend." Is it strange, then, that they should look upon this belief as a "change of heart"—their redemption—their salvation?

This conception was an elevating one, in that it turned their thoughts to higher things; and if it is a truthful conception, and if it can be made available in the salvation of mankind, it must be examined and discussed, and can not longer be thrust aside, and hidden by a veil of sanctity to protect it from the light. It must now be brought out into the day, where myths, miracles, and dreams will fade away, and vanish into nothingness, while the real vital question will be decided in that court of last resort, the Supreme Court of Reason and Common Sense.

The dogma of the miraculous paternity of Christ required that his conception and birth should be shrouded in mystery—a mystery which but few thoughtful men have even professed to have solved, and which no woman ever attempted to solve, for she *knows* better. This dogma also required that his death should take place at a time when all Nature appears to be convulsed by the agony of an expiring God, but the most credulous demanded something still more miraculous and astounding than this, and the demand is fully answered in the account attributed to St. Matthew.

Upon such evidence rests the birth and death of this most remarkable reformer, and upon it rests also "the grand plan of salvation."

As a close to this chapter we add the following leading dogmas from the creed of the Roman Catholic Church:—

"I believe and hold this true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved.

"I admit the Scriptures in the sense our Holy Mother the Church hath held, and doth hold, and to whom belongeth to judge of the true sense and interpretation; and neither will I undertake to interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

"I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.

"That in the sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and the blood, together with soul and divinity of Christ; and

that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calleth Transubstantiation."

Roman Catholics also hold the doctrine of the Trinity, which is said to be the highest and most mysterious doctrine of the Christian religion. They hold that there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and also one of the Holy Ghost, and that these are all in all—the glory equal, the majesty coeternal. It is admitted that the doctrine is not found in the Scriptures, but is supposed to be revealed in the elements of the New Testament, and also to be *indicated* in the Old Testament. They hold that the fall of our first parents is the *fundamental* doctrine on which rests the belief in the *mysteries of religion.*

CHAPTER V.

MORMONISM.

It may be said that it is not fair to compare so insignificant a body of people as the Mormons with the great Church of Rome. It is true that the Mormons, when compared with the Protestants or Catholics, appear numerically insignificant, but they equal many of the other Christian sects in numbers, and are constantly receiving additions.

An examination of the Mormon creed, and a comparison of it with that of the Roman Catholic Church, constitute our excuse for placing a notice of it by the side of, or in a chapter immediately following, one upon the Church of Rome.

In this Church of the Latter-day Saints is to be found a creed more scholarly and more carefully drawn than that of the Church of Rome—one that was manufactured to meet the necessities of the times—one that *every* Christian outside of the Mormon Church will say is not founded upon inspiration, but was manufactured by a designing man. If this be so, and if the imposture has actually taken place in this enlightened age, is it impossible for the same thing to have been done under like necessities in a less enlightened age, when the people were more superstitious and more credulous than now?

Let any one read the creed of Joseph Smith, and compare it with the creed of the Roman Catholic, the Episcopalian, the Methodist, the Baptist, or the Presbyterian, as we have done, and he will see that Joseph Smith's was a master hand, and that he outstripped them all—even Mahomet, who is the second best creedmaker, and whose creed we will shortly compare with the Catholic, as both Mahomet and Joseph Smith are considered by the Christian world as fraudulent creedmakers, and men who had no authority to make any religious dogma, and to pronounce and stamp it sacred and holy.

Joseph Smith had, like many men before him, ambition for power as the religious leader of a new church, with a new and more progressive creed of faith. In laying the foundation of this, he took into consideration the whole history of religious belief, from Pagan days down to the time he founded his church in 1840. Recognizing that there was a necessity in his plan for a further and different revelation from God, he found no difficulty in supplying such a want, namely, by resorting to the long-established way of getting it—writing it for himself. Then the question arose with him as to how he could get his pretended revelation before the world as coming from God without making the mistake which the Church of Rome made in having a written revelation sent by God, and without stating how God again came into possession of it. To have it come through a prophet, or revealed through a known inspired writer, was a means which he knew had been so often made use of that he doubted its success if tried again in this age of thoughtful skeptics.

To accomplish his purpose, and at the same time to avoid the mistakes of his predecessors in this line of business, Smith finally fixed upon a course not less miraculous and much safer from detection than any of the others. This was his plan: he would have an angel appear to him when alone and inform him where he could find buried certain gold plates containing a revelation from God engraved in characters of reformed Egyptian, and written in the fourth century by a prophet named Mormon. He was to obtain these plates and translate them himself, as the Egyptian characters were reformed so that he could write them out and place them in due form in a sacred Book of Mormon. To avoid all difficulty in the future, the angel was to take these plates back to God. With the experience of all creedmakers before him he drew up the Mormon creed. In it he incorporated the Old Testament (substantially), the trinity, the atonement through Christ's death, remission of sins, baptism, laying on of hands, and the gift of the Holy Ghost (to be administered only by apostles or elders), prophecy, healing, visions, revelations, and the power of working miracles.

Here Joseph showed his sagacity, for he was not left to resort to a council of bishops, as was the Church of Rome, when any change became necessary. He could not only make the changes himself, but, being a prophet, could get whatever he required for his church as the latest revealed will of God; and, being in this way made sacred, no one dared to question it. He added the belief in the literal gathering of Israel, and the restoration of the ten tribes. This to satisfy the Jews. Zion was to be established

on the western continent, and Christ would come again and reign personally on the earth a thousand years, when the earth would be renewed and receive its paradisaical glory.

Polygamy was no part of the faith and belief of the Mormon Church at its organization; so when Joseph desired to take another wife, while having a wife living, he considered it necessary to have some authority for so doing.

Knowing that the Old Testament sustained the plurality of wives, and that polygamy had not been prohibited by God, and recalling also that when David desired to increase the number of his wives, he not only took the wife of Uriah by force and carried her off, but had Uriah killed to prevent the scandal, notwithstanding which conduct God found David "a man after his own heart," Joseph decided to have a revelation from God upon this subject. But the example of David in taking another wife was not sufficient for Joseph: he must have special permission through a revelation direct from God, knowing that he would be safe.

In drawing up his creed, Smith omitted to insert the dogma of polygamy, as he might have done, the necessity for it not having then arisen. Immediately upon his application, he received a revelation from God, not only permitting but recommending a plurality of wives. He was successful as a prophet and as an inspired writer who had never failed in getting special authority whenever he asked for it. He had many earnest and honest followers, for every man who believes in a religion founded upon the supernatural, is not only earnest but gen-

erally honest in it. Men do not accept a religious belief lightly and go through its ceremonies for sport, no matter how foolish and ridiculous they may look to others. They are earnest and honest, and everything connected with their religion is, to them, too sacred to be discussed.

The Mormons honestly believed that Smith could walk on the water, and commune directly with God as Moses did. They also honestly believed that the church of the Latter-day Saints was founded by God, and that the Book of Mormon was inspired. Why should they not? They had precisely the same evidence to support their belief that our ancestors had to support their *Christian* belief—no more, and no less.

Taking into consideration the various religious opinions which divided the people, Joseph Smith saw the policy of making his creed so broad and so elastic that persons of all beliefs could find something in it that would meet and satisfy their religious wants.

CHAPTER VI.

MAHOMETANISM.

The Mahometan Church was founded some five hundred years after the Christian Church. To the attention of those who object to the Mormon Church on account of its numerical weakness, we will now present a church organization whose numbers *exceed* all the Protestant sects combined by more than ninety millions of people.

It will be seen that, in founding this mighty church, Mahomet took into consideration, as did the founders of the Church of Rome, and also Joseph Smith, all that had gone before and all that then existed, and remodeled the dogmas to suit himself. We can say this without fear of contradiction from Christians, as they would at once admit that any system of religion or any set of dogmas which in any way differed from the Christian religion and dogmas was false, and that Mahomet or some one else invented them.

Mahomet made the Koran, as we believe and as Christians believe. His followers, of course, deny this, and say that it is blasphemy to speak lightly of the inspired and most holy Koran.

Mahomet made the Koran a sacred book, but did not place as a warning at the close of it, "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this

prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things written in this book." He did not make use of a threat like that to frighten those who desired to investigate its origin, but merely placed upon the cover of his book this modest request: "Let none touch whose hands are not clean."

This sacred book Mahomet made the foundation of his new church. In his plan he had but one God —the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, and the Jews. He had the dogma of Original Sin, but he disposed of it, and satisfied the wrath of an angry God in a reasonable and consistent way, so that he was rid of all those perplexing doctrines which he knew were making trouble for the creed-makers at Rome. He wanted nothing to do with such men as Augustine, Pelagius, and Calvin, for he saw that the doctrine of Original Sin had given birth to many religious wrangles.

Mahomet's doctrine was that this sin was fully expiated and *wiped out* by the flood. He thus avoided the main difficulties of his predecessors, although copying their common fundamental dogmas. His plan was consistent in itself, which is more than can be said of that of the Christian Church. Noah, as a prophet of God, repaired the wrong done by the people previous to his time. Then, following Noah, was Joseph, the third Moses, the fourth Christ, and himself—of course, the last prophet and special agent of God.

By this plan Mahomet admitted that Christ established a new era in religion, and that he himself only followed Christ to indorse and carry out his prede-

cessor's mission. Knowing that the creedmakers at Rome had found it necessary, in carrying out their plans, to mutilate, alter, and add to the "inspired" writings, he therefore made a new revelation, consistent in all its parts.

All this he had transcribed into the Koran, another holy book—a new and carefully revised edition of God's will to man, to be received as the only true and full revelation.

As to the salvation of mankind, he laid his plan broader, and made it more consistent and reasonable than his predecessors had done, it being this—*that those who believe in God, and do good works, shall be saved.* This was generous; this was godlike—a principle of goodness, justice, and mercy. We have reason to be thankful when we think of the millions of beings who have lived and died in a faith so just and reasonable—a principle so equitable—held and taught in the world for eighteen centuries.

In consideration of this principle in his creed, and bearing in mind its effect upon the human race, we can overlook many of Mahomet's visionary conceptions and his selfish vanity.

As illustrating some of the absurdities introduced into the Koran, we note Mahomet's fanciful conceptions of paradise, in which he has seven different heavens, described in glowing terms. In the seventh and highest there are some remarkable apples, more wonderful than those in the Garden of Eden. They do not destroy woman and her seed to all eternity; but, on the contrary, they have seeds in them which change into girls, so pure, sweet, and beautiful, that, he says, "if they chance to spit in the sea, the waters

thereof will be no longer bitter." One of the angels that guard this heaven, he tells us, has a cow's head, with horns so long that it would take a man 4,383 years to travel to the tip of one of them. Another angel has seventy mouths, and every mouth has seventy tongues, and every tongue is praising God seventy times a day in seventy different idioms.

It would be well, in this connection, for the reader to compare this account of the different heavens with that of John, as contained in the Revelation of the Christian Bible. Mahomet had in his creed a last day of judgment, a resurrection of the dead, and a place of eternal torment.

That the Koran was written by one who expressed the prejudice of that age, the influence of which prejudice is still felt by the women of today, even in this "land of equal rights," is quite apparent from the humiliating and degraded position which he assigns to all married women in the next world; for, in describing paradise, he says: "Men only enter there, while their wives remain outside, and behold the happiness of their husbands at a distance."

After having completed the Koran, making it sacred, and thus protecting it from any inquiry as to its real origin, Mahomet found it necessary to provide for its miraculous appearance in the world, as coming from God. As he lived at a time when the credulity of the people respecting the supernatural was very strong, he ventured to omit any account whatever of God preparing it or of how he received it. He settled the difficulty by having God send an angel as his chosen agent. To make it more miraculous, and at the same time to connect it with the earlier inspired

writings, he claimed that the parchment on which the Koran was written was made from the skin of the ram which was sacrificed instead of Isaac, as recorded in the Christian Bible.

Those who object to any inquiry or discussion as to the origin of the Christian religion, and its sacred writings, will say at once that the Koran was not a sacred book, and that Mahomet's pretended revelation was mere fiction, originating in his own brain, except such historical *facts* as that of Abraham offering up Isaac as a sacrifice.

One hundred and sixty million human beings now living honestly and sincerely believe in the religion of Mahomet and in all its dogmas, and dare not raise a question as to its origin, or publicly call in question any of its doctrines. The followers of Mahomet are sincere in their belief that the Christian religion and all others are false, while theirs is true. There are also millions who believe only in the moral teachings of Fo and Buddha, and who sincerely believe that the Christian religion and all others are false. Finally, there are two hundred million Christians of the Church of Rome who sincerely believe and declare in their creed that "out of their own true Catholic faith no one can be saved."

It is hardly necessary to add the well-known fact that there are many millions of others in the world equally sincere in their belief that all religions are founded upon great errors, and that there is nothing in any religion that is really good and beneficial to mankind except the *moral principles* attached to the system. Christians would have to admit that the definition of religion contained in their creeds and articles

of faith, namely, "That bond and obligation and sense of duty which they feel from the relation in which they stand to some superior power," is, strictly speaking, *no part of their religion.*

Seeing all this diversity of opinion, so many honestly differing from all others, it follows that *some* must be mistaken, and it is possible that they may *all* be mistaken. They necessarily *must be,* if all build upon the *same* foundation, and if that foundation prove to be false and fictitious.

CHAPTER VII.

DOGMATISM.

The first protests against the doctrines and dogmas of the Church of Rome were not made by those who afterwards received the name of Protestants. As the notion of progress in ideas found its way into the minds of men, the Catholic Church had many long and bitter struggles on the subjects of faith and belief in the great mysteries of Christianity. She not only had to struggle with the Jews, who could not be made to understand the dogma of the trinity, believing, as they did, in only one God; but she had to struggle against the new doctrines constantly springing up among her own bishops and priests, many of whom she was forced to denounce as heretics long before she sentenced Luther to the "wrath of God, and the penalty of eternal fire." She also had a long, fierce, and bitter struggle in the vain effort to crush out free thought and free speech, as at one time exercised by Sabellius and Arius.

It was not until the progress of the opposing heresies sought to degrade the dignity of Christ with God that the Church was led to define the relation of the Son to the Father, and also of the Spirit to the Father. The only instance in modern times of the

rejection of this doctrine is found in the case of the Socinians, or Unitarians, who occupy a position very much like that of the ancient Ebionites.

Augustine held to the doctrine of corruption through the fall of man, and the consequent slavery of the human will. He asserted the doctrine of Predestination, by which the "elect" are foreordained to salvation, the correlative of which is reprobation. The doctrine of predestination, like the doctrine of election, had its origin in the attempt of theologians to define the relation of the human and divine, and to reconcile, if possible, the phenomena of human freedom with the belief of divine omnipotence. God's absolute will is represented by it as determining the entreme destiny of man, not according to the foreknown character of those whose fate is so determined, but merely according to God's own choice. They who are thus foreordained to eternal life are led to believe and hold by the irresistible grace of the Holy Ghost. In human salvation, therefore, God's will is everything, man's nothing.

It was in the discussion between Pelagius and Augustine that the predestination of the "decree" was first fully evolved. Since that time the opinions of the Church have run in two great currents — the one maintaining that decree was subordinate to divine foreknowledge of human character; the other (that of Augustine) maintained the absolutism of the decree, and its independence of all prior human conditions. Pelagius recognized the possibility of good in human nature; Augustine denied any such possibility apart from the influence of divine grace. The one held that the choice of salvation was by man's

will; the other, that man's will had no active freedom or power of choice since "the fall."

After the Reformation came the contest leading to the condemnation of the Arminians in the Council of Trent, and the widening of the separation dividing the disciples of Calvin from those theologians who held broader and freer views on the subject of atonement. These contests indicate the impossibility of the human reason and conscience ever resting satisfied with a purely and absolutely logical theory of the relations between the will of God and the moral superiority of man.

The tendency of modern inquiry seems to be to abandon the discussion of a point so obviously incapable of being determined by human intelligence, and to examine instead the moral and political bearing of God's will upon our human conditions. The moral meaning of that will is of vital moment to men, they apparently being unable to determine the extent of its power upon their own wills.

Augustine strenuously opposed the Pelagians, not only their opinions, but also the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints; and justified the punishment for religious errors by civil penalties, even to burning the heretics. Pelagius and his doctrines were twice condemned by the Church, and he was finally banished from Rome.

At the close of the great controversy over the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation, the speculation which had for nearly a century wearied itself in vain endeavors to make plain the inscrutable mysteries of the divine nature, at length turned inward upon itself; and no one at all familiar with the con-

troversy on Pelagianism can doubt that the broader view of the capabilities of human nature which lies at the root of all theories of which Pelagianism was but the exponent, was a reaction against the cruel and degrading conception of the nature and origin of the soul which characterized the philosophy, not alone of the Manicheans, but of all dualistic religions which spring from the prolific root of Gnosticism.

To the Manicheans, and to all others who adopted the Gnosticisms as to the origin and nature of matter and material substance, man was, in his physical nature, evil, and incapable of good. The Christian teachers, in combating this view, easily passed into an opposite extreme, and in overlooking and explaining away the strong language of the Scriptures, were led to represent man as endowed with full capacity for all good; and as long as the only advocates to be controverted were those who urged the views of the Gnostic school, the line taken by Christian writers was but little guarded by any of those limitations and reasons which have arisen in later controversy; and thus the earlier Fathers, especially those in the Eastern church where Gnosticism was chiefly to be combated, are found to press earnestly the power for good which man possesses, without entering minutely into the origin or motive-principle of the power. But whatever vagaries hang over this important question, they were dissipated by the bold and fierce statements of Pelagius, or at least by the discussion which at once arose on the primitive state of man.

The Pelagian theory, in a word, was that man, as coming from his creator, had possessed in himself,

and as constituents of his own nature, all the powers which are necessary for the attainment of salvation; that by God he merits eternal life, and all rewards by a strict title of justice; and that to suppose grace to be necessary is in truth to destroy the assurance of free will. This doctrine was somewhat modified in the semi-Pelagian system.

The Catholic school, without exception, maintained the necessity of grace for the performance not only of all meritorious but of all supernatural good works; and they are equally unanimous in maintaining that the grace called "efficacious" does not destroy the freedom of the will. They distinguish between the natural and the supernatural order, and between the power and gifts which are proper to the one and to the other. Man is able, therefore, without any supernatural grace, to perform merely good works, and to fulfil purely natural obligations. But in order to realize the works in the supernatural, and the rewards promised for such works, the will of man must be moved and strengthened by supernatural grace, with which the will freely co-operates, but which is the purely gratuitous gift of God—so purely gratuitous that though God has promised eternal life as the reward of man's co-operation, yet these must arise entirely from God's gift and promise, and not from the natural powers of the human will.

One of the teachings of the Catholic school is termed the Molinistic, which gives most to liberty, and lies nearer the border of Pelagianism, but is clearly distinguished from it by maintaining the necessity of grace for every supernatural act. In the

Reformed Church the Arminian doctrine may be said to correspond in the main with the Molenist system in the Romish Church.

The Gnostics, in most things—though not in all particulars—fall in with the Jansenistic view. The Pelagian views are distinctively represented in modern controversies by the Socinians and Rationalists; and very many of them who—outside of the Romish Church—have at various times engaged in the predestinary controversy on the side of free will, have leaned toward—if they have not fully accepted—the Pelagian views.

The Jansenists have been stigmatized, even by the Catholics and Pelagians. The Thomists are called by the Jansenists, indiscriminately, Jansenists and Calvinists, while both unite in representing Calvin and his school as substantially Manicheans.

Hardly one among the many Christian controversies has called forth a greater amount of subtlety and power than this, and not one has so long and persistently maintained its solidity. Within twenty-five years after its first appearance upward of thirty councils were held for the purpose of this discussion. It lay at the bottom of all dialectics in the mediæval philosophic schools; and there is hardly a single subject which has come into discussion under so many different forms in modern controversy.

The Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession of Faith contain the dogma of original sin, now recognized as orthodox doctrine in the Church of England, and (more or less modified) in many of the Protestant churches of America. After a contest by theologians over these articles and this confession

through these many centuries, they still remain the basis upon which stand all Protestant churches recognized by Christians as orthodox.

"Original sin standeth not in the fall of Adam (as the Pelagians vainly talk), but in the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore, in every person born into the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation."

Chapter VI. of the Westminster Confession of Faith reads as follows:—

"By this sin [eating the apple] they [Adam and Eve] fell from their original righteousness and communication with God, and so became dead in sin and wholly defiled in all particulars and parts of soul and body. They being the root of mankind, the guilt of this sin was imparted, and the said death in sin and corrupt nature conveyed to all their posterity descended from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to do all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions."

CHAPTER VIII.

MARTIN LUTHER AND JOHN CALVIN.

Foremost among the names of the sixteenth century stand those of Martin Luther and John Calvin. It is with the doctrines of these two men that this chapter has to do.

It was while in Rome, in 1507, that Martin Luther, becoming disgusted with the levity and frivolity of the clergy, and the ignorance and vices of the people, turned to the teachings of Augustine and found light, repose, and joy, in the doctrine of justification by faith alone. He no longer acknowledged the authority of the Church of Rome, nor any authority but that of the Scriptures. The following then became the platform upon which Protestantism was founded by him:—

"The Scriptures are the only reliable grounds of authority in religion; and, moreover, every man has the right to interpret them for himself."

This doctrine was afterward held by Knox, Cranmer, and the Protestants generally.

One of the greatest abominations of any age—the sale of indulgences—existed in the time of Luther. One Tetzel, a Catholic priest, while selling indulgences from the Pope, said, "They are the most

precious and sublime of God's gifts. There is no sin so great that an indulgence from the Pope can not remit it."

Great excitement was caused about this time by a public controversy which Luther had with Tetzel upon this subject, in which Luther denounced the papacy as "the scarlet mother of abominations," and followed up this declaration by nailing to the gates of his church his ninety-five propositions striking at the root of papal pretensions. This bold act necessarily caused his excommunication, whereby the Pope sentenced him to "the wrath of God, and to the penalty of eternal fire"; and condemned his writings as "heretical and damnable." One can not but admire the bravery and firmness with which Luther endured these ordeals. At the Diet of Worms, when being tried for these offenses, he stubbornly refused to recant, saying, "I will not and can not recant, for it is not safe for a man to go against his own conscience. Here I am. God help me. Amen."

There were other converts who desired more sweeping and radical changes than Luther did. He differed but little from the Catholics in his religious doctrines, except that he denied the authority of the Pope, and recognized only that of the Scriptures.

Shortly after the papal bull had been issued excommunicating Martin Luther from the Church of Rome, John Calvin succeeded in establishing at Geneva his plan of Protestant church government, in all its details. He founded a theocracy, with himself at the head, in which he aimed, virtually, to direct all the affairs of the city, and to control and modify both the social and individual life of the citizen. Not

without a struggle, it may be supposed, did he succeed in his great theocratic scheme.

Calvin met with much opposition from a party in the city called "Libertines," the struggle with this party lasting, with varying fortunes, for no less than fifteen years. Calvin not only carried on this struggle with the Libertines of the city, but engaged in many bitter disputes upon religious dogmas, some of which had been framed by himself.

One of the disciples of Calvin, named Michael Servetus, had the boldness to deny the doctrine of the Trinity, as taught by Calvin. This angered the divine to such an extent that he denounced Servetus as a wicked and cruel Spaniard, and afterwards caused his death, which occurred in this wise: While Servetus was passing through Geneva on his way to Italy, he was arrested and imprisoned, at the instance of Calvin, and afterward condemned and burned at the stake.

This barbarous and unchristianlike act has ever been a dark stain upon the character of this great leader of the Protestant church.

Although stern of speech and unyielding, like all fanatics, still Calvin was not petty in his nature. When he committed an outrage it was a wholesale one. Arbitrary when it suited his purpose to be so, he was outwardly meek, as becomes a divine.

Calvin was the great theologian of the Reformation — the founder of a new church policy which did more than all other influences to consolidate the scattered forces of the Reformation and give them an enduring strength. He also systematized the doc-

trines of Protestantism, organizing its educational discipline.

The churches distinguished by holding the doctrines of Calvin have been termed Reformed, in contradistinction to the Lutheran and Anglican Churches. The characteristic feature of Calvinism is that it is a speculative Christian system springing from a single great principle carried out rigorously in all its logical consequences. The following are the avowed opinions of the Calvinists:—

"I.—*On Predestination.*—That all men have sinned in Adam, and become liable to the curse, but that God has, by an eternal decree, chosen some, from the beginning, to whom he should impart faith, of his free grace, and, consequently, salvation.

"II.—*Of the death of Christ.*—That it is a sufficient sacrifice for the whole world, and that some only believe and are saved, whereas many perish in unbelief, arising, not from any defect in the sacrifice, but from the perversity of the non-elect.

"III.—*Of Man's Corruption.*—That all men are conceived in sin, and born the children of wrath, and are now unable to return to God without the aid of the Holy Spirit.

"IV.—*Of Grace and Free Will.*—That the influence of the Spirit on our fallen natures does not force, but only quickens and corrects them, inclining quickly to return to God by an exercise of their free will.

"V.—*On Predestination.*—That God does not wholly take away his Spirit from his *own* children in lamentable falls, nor does he permit them to fall finally from the grace of adoption and state of justification."

In New England the name "Orthodox" is now given to those who accept Calvin's doctrines in their most rigorous application. The doctrines of the Arminians, as opposed to the doctrines of the Calvinists, maintain that God predicated the salvation or condemnation of individuals, only having foreknown who would and who would not accept the offered mercy.

After the death of their founder and leader (Arminius), his followers rapidly increased, and were immediately attacked by the Calvinists. So grievous were their persecutions that in 1610 the Arminians addressed a petition to the States of Holland for protection, from which they received the name of Remonstrants. Their petition to the States was followed by an edict guaranteeing full protection to both parties.

This act displeased the Calvinists, who continued their persecutions with such ardor that at length the doctrines of the Arminians were condemned by the Synod of Dort, and the clergy driven from their churches and forbidden the exercise of their ministry in public. Owing to this, many left the country, and found refuge in France, England, and other countries. In England their tenets were adopted by the Wesleyan Methodists, as well as by numerous other churches.

The views of the Arminians are summed up in the following articles:—

First.—That God has from all eternity determined to save all he foreknew would persevere in the faith, and to condemn all who should continue in unbelief.

Second.—That Christ died for all men, but only those who believe are saved by his death.

Third.—That man, of himself, is incapable of true faith; and must, therefore, be born again of God, through Christ, by the Holy Spirit.

Fourth.—That all good works are attributed to the Holy Spirit, which, however, does not force a man against his own inclinations.

Fifth.—That God gives the truly faithful the power to resist sin, but the possibility of a fall from grace must be determined from a further examination of the Scriptures.

The last part of this article was left an open question until God could be further consulted as to his intentions. It was, however, soon after decided in the affirmative; whereupon the Calvinists, eager for the fray, put forth a strong counter remonstrance, asserting plainly and absolutely the doctrine of predestination and reprobation.

The controversy in Holland now became merged in the strife of party politics. The ambitious Maurice of Orange took advantage of the passions of the majority to crush his opponents of the republican party, whose leaders were the adherents of the Arminian doctrines. Several Arminians were put to death, among them an aged Senator, while many others were persecuted and imprisoned.

Under these circumstances the Synod of Dort was held. Since that time the Remonstrants in Holland, who were Arminians, have inclined more and more toward freedom of thought in religious questions, as well as independence in church government; especially in the free interpretation of the Scriptures, preference being given to the moral rather than the doctrinal teachings; in rejecting the Trinity; the virtual rejec-

tion of the doctrines of original sin and imputed righteousness; and the views of the sacrament as merely edifying forms or ceremonies. All these and other points of belief display the same tendency, which we have been able to observe and carefully note.

In the struggle between Calvinism and Arminianism may be seen the dogmatic gladiators as they wrestle with each other in the arena of the Christian Church. In what direct contrast are the acts of these men, claiming to be the true followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, with the teachings of that one they professed to follow, who said, "Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you"!

Christians (many of them) will say, but not rightfully so, that these are old doctrines, applicable to the church in a more ignorant age than this. The religious dogmas of Calvin and Arminius divide the different Protestant sects today. Wherever the people have risen above them, as they necessarily must in this age of progressive thought, the tendency is all in one direction — away from dictation, and toward freedom. This is now witnessed in Germany, the cradle of Protestantism; and also in America, the land of blue-laws — the hotbed of fanaticism.

CHAPTER IX.

THE GODHEAD.

Opposed to the belief in a triune God, as held by the Mother Church, was the belief entertained by one Sabellius, a Roman Catholic bishop of Upper Egypt, and one of the most profound thinkers of the Church, who strenuously maintained that there was but one person in the Godhead.

The Arians, also—a religious sect taking their name from one Arius—held that Christ, the Son of God, is the most exalted of all created beings, but inferior to God the Father, and created by his free will. As a punishment for holding this heretical belief, a synod of bishops at Alexandria deposed and excommunicated Arius. He, in order to escape persecution, retired to Palestine, where he wrote a letter to his friend Eusebius, said to have been the most influential Christian of his time. This friend of Arius warmly sympathized with him, not only writing in his behalf, but causing his absolution from the Alexandrian excommunication, and his restoration to the Mother Church.

To show that this question of the Godhead was considered of vital importance, we quote from an encyclopedia the following account of the trial of Arius:—

"It became impossible for the Emperor to remain neutral or indifferent, with safety to himself or tranquillity to the Empire. The result was, Constantine was forced to convoke the memorable Council of Nice, which consisted of 318 bishops, from almost all parts of the Christian world, especially the East, together with a great number of priests and acolites.

"Arius boldly expounded and defended his opinions, and declared in the most positive manner that the Son of God was created out of *nothing*, that he was not immutable, that he had not always existed, that through the freedom of his will he remained good and holy, and that, if he had chosen, he could as easily have sinned as not: in a word, that he was a creature, and the work of the Deity.

"These propositions were listened to with great calmness by the bishops, but the inferior clergy — or, at least, most of them — maintained the most violent opposition. The documents containing his confession of faith were torn to pieces before his face. Arguments, however, of a more rational kind were also employed. Alexander was ably seconded by Athanasius, the equal of Arius in eloquence and power of logic.

"It was principally by the reasoning of Athanasius that the Council was prevailed upon to define, in the most precise terms, the doctrine of the Godhead, namely: The absolute unity of the divine essence, and the absolute equality of the three persons. All the bishops subscribed to the finding except two, who followed Arius into banishment."

Is it not a little strange that in all the changes

made in the Scriptures up to this time, the word "Trinity" does not occur? Not in the Apostolic creed, nor in the Nicene creed, but first appeared in the Athanasian creed, and was dwelt upon by Athanasius when defending this new dogma of the Trinity.

CHAPTER X.

PERSECUTIONS OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS.

Among the saints who suffered martyrdom for teaching a new religion, differing from that of both Pagan and Jew, were Stephen, who was stoned to death; James, called the Great, who was beheaded; Philip, scourged, and then crucified; Matthew, slain with a halberd; Mark, dragged on the ground until he died; James the Less, cast down from the pinnacle of a temple, and his brains afterward beaten out with a club; Matthias, first stoned, and then beheaded; Andrew, crucified; Peter, scourged, and then crucified, with his head downward; Paul, beheaded; Jude, crucified; Bartholomew, scourged, crucified, and then beheaded; Thomas, speared to death; Luke, hanged; and Simon, crucified.

During the first year's reign of the tyrant Nero occurred a most cruel and inhuman persecution of Christians, only equalled in barbarity by those under his successor Domitian, who attempted to slay all the lineage of David, under the supposition that Christ was the son of Joseph, and therefore in David's line of descent.

All persons brought before a magistrate, and charged with being Christians, were given their choice — to surrender their religion, or suffer punish-

ment. The punishment inflicted was either confiscation of property, banishment, broiling upon a slow fire, racking, burning, scourging, stoning, hanging, or worrying with dogs and wild beasts. Many were torn piecemeal with hot pincers, while others were thrown upon the horns of furious bulls.

These cruel and inhuman persecutions by the Roman Emperors were continued, without cessation, for more than three hundred years.

Upon the disappearance of the last Cæsar we come to a remarkable epoch in the history of Christianity, namely, the reign of a Roman Emperor who himself professed Christianity. On the death of his father in Britain, Constantine was at once proclaimed Emperor by the soldiers there. He had immediately to enter upon a contest with no less than five rivals, and the circumstance attending his conversion is associated with an event that took place at this time. While on the march to attack one of his rivals, Maxentius, Constantine is reported to have seen, with his own eyes, the luminous trophy of the cross in the sky placed above the meridian sun, and inscribed with the following words: "By this conquer." In the battle that followed, Maxentius is said to have been completely overthrown. This, it is said, decided Constantine to become a Christian. The early church historians also add that the following night Christ appeared to Constantine in a dream, and commanded him to erect a similar standard, and, under it, to march, with an assurance of victory, against all his enemies. This is the origin of the celebrated cross, or labarum, displayed by all the Roman Emperors in their military expeditions; and around which Chris-

tians have continued to rally to engage in the persecution of all others differing from them in religious belief. And as they put to rack, burned, and slaughtered heretics, they have looked up to this inscription, "In this overcome," relying upon it as a sacred promise of God to assist and protect them while slaughtering their fellow-creatures.

CHAPTER XI.

CHRISTIANS PERSECUTE CHRISTIANS.

After the Roman Catholic Council had condemned Arius for heresy, such had been the effect upon the Emperor of all these arguments in favor of the belief as held by Arius, that he was led to accept the belief of Arius as his own, and he immediately set about to enforce his new convictions upon every one else. It is said by historians that in cruelty his persecutions were little short of those of the Pagans. He banished the priests, shut up the churches, plundered their effects, and murdered all who did not flee for their lives. While some orthodox Catholics were holding a meeting out in the desert, for safety, the Emperor caused a Roman general, with his soldiers, to fall upon them while at prayers, slaughtering great numbers of them.

For several years the whole Roman Empire was a scene of continued rapine and slaughter over this foolish and unreasonable dogma as to the probable age of Christ.

Many of the Vandals embraced the Christian religion, or claimed to embrace it, for they, like Arius, did not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the Mother Church. With this addition to their numbers, the armies of the Emperor swept over the

country like a tornado, plundering the churches, massacring the bishops and priests, and applying new and more horrid torture than was ever before known, such as pouring fetid oil and vinegar down the throats of their victims until they expired, suffocating others by filling their mouths with mud, murdering others by stretching their limbs with screws until their veins burst. Old men found no mercy, and even infants felt the rage of pursuing Christians.

Stately buildings were destroyed; and the principal cathedrals of Carthage were used for the brutal purposes of the plunderers. When any castle held out against them, they brought numbers of captive Christians and slew them, leaving their bodies to putrefy under the walls, thus compelling the besieged to surrender on account of the offensive stench.

All this misery and bloodshed was brought upon the human race by a contention over a question foolish and trivial in itself, and a question which is beyond the ability of man to determine.

Has not the tendency of modern thought been in advance of this? And has not this advancement come from investigation, discussion, and reason, applied to every subject?

But to return to the history of the times. There were many Catholic Christians in France, comprising a sect called Waldenses, who denounced many of the dogmas of the Church. Their principal accusation was that the Church of Rome claimed to be the only infallible church of Christ upon the earth, and that the Pope, as the vicegerent of Christ, was the head of the Church; that in the doctrine of transubstantiation it was absurd to claim that the bread and wine

given in the sacrament was the very identical body and blood of Christ when he was nailed to the cross. They also objected to many other doctrines and ceremonies of the Church, pronouncing them unreasonable.

These heresies of the Waldenses exasperated Philip, King of France, to such an extent that he placed their provinces under military surveillance, and began a rigorous and cruel persecution of these people. The military destroyed the country-seats of three hundred gentlemen who were considered heretics, and drove many out of the country.

The Pope pronounced these persons heretics, and issued his usual bombastic anathema against them. In this he decreed that they were incapable of holding places of trust, honor, or profit, and ordered their lands and goods to be seized and confiscated for the benefit of the most Holy Church of Christ, and that all the rebellious Catholics be refused burial in consecrated ground.

In this persecution the Pope appointed certain special agents, or inquisitors, to go as spies to search out all persons having the audacity to question any of his decrees, made as the only vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth. All heretics were to be secretly reported to him.

This system of employing detectives in the churches as scavengers, to scent out those who were so reckless as to think for themselves, at last led the pope to establish the Inquisition—an institution more iniquitous, bloody, and hellish, than, we believe, is possible for any fiend to have witnessed in God's chosen place for sinners.

While one of these Christian lieutenants—an archdeacon—was acting as such a scavenger for the most Holy Church, and following, like a bloodhound, some fleeing Waldenses, he found they had hidden themselves in a large cave. He immediately had the mouth of the cave closed up with dry fagots, which they set on fire, and all within the cave were suffocated.

In making their report of this wholesale slaughter, the villains were able to say that they had destroyed 3,000 heretics; and that they had, by chance, fallen upon heresy in its "budding season," as there were four hundred infants, with their mothers, in the cave, who perished with the rest.

CHAPTER XII.

THE WRONGS OF IRELAND.

Well might the little child ask the question, "What has Ireland done, mother?"

England long since attempted to crush out all political and religious liberty in Ireland, for she was determined to strip the Pope at Rome of his slaves in Erin, and make them the slaves of English aristocrats. That she attempted this the records of the English Parliament do show, and still remain as a lasting disgrace, not only to religious fanatics, but to the English nation. The English people are now displaying the same spirit in their efforts to crush that "grand old man" who has been standing up for Ireland's freedom, like the old god Thalus, "with his iron flail, threshing out falsehood."

The effect of the persecution of Irish Catholics—and nearly all the inhabitants of Ireland are such—was even greater and more lasting than any other religious persecution, for it was not only a wholesale robbing of their lands at the time, but a robbery, the effects of which have descended, like those of "original sin," to all their innocent children, until this day.

While power is ever exercised by the strong over the weak, yet who are the weak and who the strong depends upon circumstances, and not upon Prov-

idence. In going over the history of the religious persecutions of these times, the details are most harrowing.

We have seen that when Catholics held the power in their hands, they never failed to make use of it to oppress Protestants, while, at the same time, let the Protestants once get the power into their hands, they never failed to use it in persecuting Catholics.

The following was at one time the situation of Irishmen. A rebellious feeling for wrongs done them that could no longer be quietly endured, had assumed the form of organized resistance to the English Government. Forfeited lands were promised by the English Government to those who would aid in the suppression of this rebellion. The Catholics had to successively encounter the party of the king, the Puritan Parliament, the Scotch Presbyterians among themselves; the fierce, relentless energy of Cromwell, with his feeling of animosity quickened by religious bigotry; the greediness of those after confiscated estates; and the intolerant pride of power of their Protestant persecutors.

At the restoration of Charles II. a declaration of settlement comprised even the escheats of land decreed by the republican party for the loyalty of the owners to the Stewarts. It is the opinion of an English historian, that, upon the whole result, the Irish Catholics having previously held about two-thirds of the kingdom, they lost more than one-half of their possessions by forfeiture.

The favor of James II. brought nothing but evil to the Catholic Irish, for they had to share in his defeat, after their vain attempt to make Ireland his

independent place of refuge. After a gallant resistance for three years, the Irish, at Limerick, capitulated to the new dynasty, obtaining the royal promise of security of worship to the Roman Catholics, and the continued possession of their estates, free from all outlawries of forfeiture.

Of these articles, the first was totally disregarded and the other evaded. New forfeitures followed, to the extent of millions of acres; and at the close of the seventeenth century the native Irish, with Anglo-Irish Catholics, possessed not more than a seventh of the Ireland once their own.

An act of the English Parliament rehearsed the dangers to be apprehended from the presence of popish resuscitants in the Irish Parliament, and required of every member the new oath of allegiance and supremacy, and declaration against transubstantiation.

But Catholics were not only excluded from seats in both houses of the legislature, but a series of enactments were passed, the fruit of relentless penance, gradually excluding papists from having any votes for the election of members of Parliament.

The Catholic Irish were disfranchised by one enactment after another, until they suffered under a universal, unmitigated, exceptionless disqualification. In the courts of law they could not gain a place upon the bench, nor act as barristers, attorneys, or solicitors; serve as hired clerks, sheriffs, justices of peace, sit on a grand jury, nor even hold the lowest civil office of trust and profit. They could have no privilege in a town corporation, nor vote at a vestry meeting. If papists would trade and work, they must do

so in their native towns as aliens. They were expressly prohibited from taking more than two apprentices in any employment, except in the linen manufacture.

A Catholic might not marry a Protestant, nor be a guardian to any child. He could not educate his own children, even if the mother declared herself a Protestant, not even if his own child, however young, should be a Protestant. The priest who should celebrate a marriage between a Catholic and a Protestant was to be hanged.

None but those who conformed to the established church were admitted to the universities, nor could degrees be obtained but by those who had taken all the test-oaths and declarations. No Protestant in Ireland might instruct a papist, neither could they supply this want by academies or schools of their own. For a Catholic even to trade in a private family, or to act as usher in a Protestant family, was a felony, punishable with imprisonment, exile, or death. Thus papists were excluded from all opportunities of education at home, except by stealth and violation of law.

It might be thought that schools abroad were open to them; but, by a statute of William, "to be educated in any foreign school was an unalterable and perpetual outlawry." The child sent abroad for education, no matter of how tender an age, or himself how innocent, could never after sue in law or equity, nor could be guardian, executor, or administrator, nor receive any legacy or deed of gift; he also forfeited all his goods and chattels, and all his lands for his

lifetime. Whoever sent him abroad, or maintained him there by money or otherwise, incurred the same liability and penalties. The crown divided the forfeited fortune with the informer, and when a person was found to have sent abroad a bill of exchange or money, on him rested the burden of proving that the remittance was innocent; and he must do so before a justice, without the benefit of a jury.

The Irish Catholics were deprived of the opportunity of worship, except by connivance. Their clergy, taken from the humbler classes of people, could not be taught at home, nor be sent abroad for education. Such priests as were permitted to reside in Ireland were registered, and kept like prisoners at large, within prescribed limits. All papists exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, all monks, friars, and all priests then not actually in parishes, and registered, were banished from Ireland under pain of transportation, and upon return were hanged, drawn, and quartered. Avarice was stimulated to apprehend them by the promise of reward. He that should harbor or conceal them was to be stripped of all his property. When the registered priests were dead, the law, which was made perpetual, applied to every papist priest.

By the law of William and Mary, St. Patrick in Ireland in the eighteenth century would have been considered a felon. Any two justices of the peace might call before them any Catholic, and make inquiries as to when he heard mass, who were present, and whether any Catholic schoolmaster or priest was present. Should he refuse to answer the question, he was fined or sentenced to a year's imprisonment.

The Catholic priest abjuring his religion was to receive from Government a pension of thirty, and afterwards forty, pounds.

In spite of these laws, it is said there were four thousand clergymen in Ireland, and Catholic worship gained on the Protestant—so attractive is curiosity when ennobled by persecution—though the laws did not presume a papist to exist there, and did not allow one to breathe there except by sufferance of the Government.

The Catholics had been plundered of six-sevenths of the land by iniquitous confiscations; and every acre of the remaining seventh was grudged them by the Protestants. No nonconforming Catholic could buy land, nor receive it by descent, devise, or settlement; nor loan money on it as a security; nor hold an interest in it through a Protestant trustee; nor take a lease of ground for more than thirty-one years. If, under such a lease, he brought his farm to produce more than one-third beyond the rent, the first Protestant discoverer might sue for the lease before known Protestants, making the defendant answer all interrogatories, on oath, so that the farmer dared not drain his fields, inclose them, or build solid houses on them. It was to the interest of the farmer rather to let the country deteriorate, lest envy should prompt some Protestant to turn him out of doors.

If a Catholic owned a horse worth more than five pounds, any Protestant might take it away from him. Nor was natural affection or parental authority respected. The son of a Catholic, no matter how dissolute or how young, if he would but join the English

Church and pretend to be a Protestant Christian, could turn his father's estate in fee simple into a tenancy for life, becoming himself the owner, and annulling every agreement made by his father. The Catholic father could not in any degree disinherit this unnatural son; but the child, in declaring himself a Protestant, might compel his father to confess, under oath, the value of his substance, real or personal, whereupon the Protestant court might, out of it, award the son immediate maintenance, and, after the father's death, he might take and hold the property. If the parent, by his industry, improved his property, the son might compel an account of the value of the estate, in order to a new dispensation. The father had no security against the acts of his children, except by abandoning all acquisition or improvement.

The proprietors in fee were probably less than in any other country in western Europe, parts of Catholic Spain only excepted. The consequence was an unexampled complication of titles. The landlord-in-chief was only known as having dominion over the estate. Leases of large tracts of land had been granted for very long terms, and these were again subdivided to those who subdivided them once more, and so on indefinitely.

Mortgages brought a new and ravenous class of claimants. The human connection between the tenant and landlord was not provided for. Leases were in the last resort most frequently given at will, and then what defense had the Irish Catholic against his Protestant superior?

To this degradation of the Irish Catholic may be attributed the thatched mud cabin, without window

or chimney; the cheap fences; the morass undrained; idleness in winter; the tenant's concealment of good returns; and his fear of spending his savings in the improvement of his farm. Hence the incessant recurrence of the deadliest epidemics.

Ireland found long ago that arbitrary power exercised over her people by an aristocratic landlord was not only crowding them down lower and lower, and holding them there, but she has found that no man or set of men has any such right; for God had given that people all the natural rights now claimed by others. Ireland has been learning this while passing through a sad experience in her long and earnest struggle for that relief which still lingers in its coming.

She has seen that this hereditary aristocracy, claiming so great a superiority over her, was a mere sham, a pretense made use of to overawe her. At the same time she was required to look up to it as being entitled to homage; it was only using this influence to wring from her her hard earnings, to be squandered in lives of idleness and debauchery. She has also learned that the divine right of a king, with absolute authority over her people, was a mere sham, a scheme to keep up the dignity of a royal family and its profligate household.

That the king not only received his title from a divine source, but that he was the only head of the Christian Church, and that his subjects must obey the royal edicts as the will of God—this they have found to be another sham.

Millions of Irishmen and men of Irish descent are to be found in every city, town, State, or Territory of

this broad land, so that today there are more Irishmen in America than in Ireland. As citizens of this republic they stand upon an equal footing with the highest. They have found that when there is the greatest individual freedom, and when each citizen is allowed to act for himself, not interfering with the rights of other citizens, there is to be found the greatest individual prosperity and individual happiness. They have found that it is not necessary, neither is it the will of God, to keep them forever in the shackles of political slavery for the benefit of any man, or set of men, pretending to have some divine authority over them. They have not followed the example of their ancestors by submissively allowing their English masters to think for them upon the subject of political freedom, but have thought for themselves, refusing to be longer misled by those who, merely for their own pleasure, profit, and personal interests, wish to keep them in a condition of slavery, which would be wholly defeated if Irishmen were once allowed to do their own thinking. As they have already found that the aristocratic landlord, as well as the divinely appointed king, is an impostor — nothing more, nothing higher, than a mere man — can they not be made to see that for centuries they have been intentionally and cruelly deceived by the Pope and his eager agents, the priests, who are only men — nothing more, nothing higher?

When Irishmen will stand up in all the strength of their manhood to do their own thinking on all subjects, religious as well as political, then will they cease to be slaves to any landlord, king, priest, or pope, or of any man or set of men on the face of the earth.

Let any Irishman reflect upon this subject for one hour, calling up all that Ireland has suffered for centuries; remember that this has all fallen upon her under the heavy hand of an aristocrat, and he will see that the same unfeeling king and landlord have but followed the example of a greedy church organization, that, under the control of a wily and ambitious Pope, has been sucking Ireland's very life-blood, and doing it all for its own interests and those of church lackeys; let him do this for one hour, and he must, it seems to us, rise up determined to be a free man, no longer the trembling slave of a Pope.

Should any reader say that this is nothing but a tirade of words flattering the Irish and slandering the Church of Rome, and that it must come from one desiring to build up the Protestant church by attacking the Catholic, let him but read the whole book, and he will see that this is written by one who is disinterested, and who is neither asking nor expecting anything from the Irish laborers, and who has no more feeling against the Church of Rome than against any of her Protestant offspring.

CHAPTER XIII.

HUGUENOTS PERSECUTE CATHOLICS.—CATHOLICS PERSECUTE HUGUENOTS.

The early followers of Martin Luther and John Calvin received, in France, the name of Huguenots, and the history of their rise and progress forms one of the leading chapters in the annals of that country.

For some time after their establishment as a sect, the Huguenots continued to increase in numbers, although they were troubled with occasional persecutions under the reign of Francis I. and Henry II. It is with the persecutions of this people, as well as their persecutions of Catholics, that this chapter has to do.

The Huguenots by no means escaped contagion from the fury of their religious antagonists, which, however, spent most of its force upon cathedrals, stones, images, and whatever belonged to the Catholics. On the 21st of April, 1562, ten years before the great Massacre of St. Bartholomew, they began the lamentable destruction of the gigantic yet fairy-like monuments of the noblest aspirations of the Middle Ages. On that day the Huguenots commenced their work of destruction on the cathedrals and churches of Orleans, overthrowing the altars, defacing the tracery, breaking the emblazoned windows, and burn-

ing the richly carved woodwork. The demons of destruction awoke as at a trumpet-blast, and swarmed over the whole length and breadth of France. The crowbar, the hammer, and the ax were plied with merciless fury from one end of the kingdom to the other, and the elaborate workmanship of five hundred years perished in a day.

The bones of saints were torn from their resting-places, sometimes wrested from the priests to be defiled and burned, while the rabble paraded themselves in mock solemnity, with miters of bishops and abbots on their heads, and sachets and capes and other priestly vestments upon their shoulders, before throwing them into the blazing bonfire of the market-place. Such a storm of sacrifice and violence worked in the breasts of the Catholic masses a feeling of revenge of the deadliest intensity for bloody Christian vengeance.

In every province the two Christian factions waited only for the word to spring like ferocious beasts upon each other—to kill, or be killed. Many of the most enlightened, of both creeds, looked upon the coexistence of the two different forms of Christian worship in the same country as absolutely impossible. The Catholics regarded the very contemplation of such a thing as impious and treasonable, while the conviction of the Huguenots was that there was no true religion but that of the primitive church—the only one to be tolerated in the state.

The Catholics soon found an opportunity to wreak vengeance on their Christian brothers, the Protestants. On the night of August 23–24, 1572, the dreadful tragedy known as the Massacre of St. Bartholomew

began. The tocsin was sounded at two in the morning. All had been arranged beforehand, and the participants carried a scarf on the left arm and a white cross in the hat for better distinction. Death reigned throughout Paris; the Huguenots rushed out of their houses, half naked, at the sound of the tocsin and the cries of their brethren, and were slaughtered in the streets.

After three days of direful destruction there fell a dead silence upon the streets of Paris—there was nobody left to slaughter. Ten thousand victims are said to have fallen in the city. Royal orders were then forwarded throughout the provinces for the renewal of the massacre, and forty-five thousand more victims were sacrificed. And all for what?

Queen Catherine and her son had anticipated, as the result of this blow, a reign of submission, and the termination of the civil wars. In this they were mistaken. The Huguenots, utterly desperate, flew to arms. The war broke out with greater fury than before, and it was terminated only after a year of bloodshed. Upon the accession of Henry IV. to the throne of France, his first care was to terminate the religious disputes which had so long distracted the kingdom. For this purpose, he, in 1598, promulgated the celebrated Edict of Nantes, which re-established all the favors that had ever been granted to Protestants by other princes. The Edict of Nantes put an end to the disastrous wars which for thirty-six years had desolated the kingdom.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PURITANS.

While a struggle was going on in Germany for religious, and in France for political, liberty, a contest was waging in England for liberty both political and religious. The great Protestant contest began in the reign of James I., closing only after two revolutions, and a century of strife and suffering. Under the belief that the Catholics had originated "The Gunpowder Plot" all Catholics were detested by the people. Penal statutes multiplied against them, by the terms of which none were allowed to live at court or in London, or within ten miles of it; to move more than ten miles from their home without a license; to practice surgery, physic, or law; nor to act as judge, clerk of any court or corporation; or to act as administrator, executor, trustee, or guardian. More than this, every Catholic who refused to have his child baptized by a Protestant was obliged to pay one hundred pounds. Every person keeping a Catholic servant was obliged to pay ten pounds a month to the Government.

Upon the death of James, Charles I. came to the throne. Under his rule commenced the English Revolution — a struggle of the people for the inherent and natural rights which had been wrongfully with-

held from them. The people were firm in their resolve, believing that God gave the king no divine right to enslave his subjects. During this reign many Protestants, called Dissenters, were forced to leave England on account of the persecution by the Church of England, and found a refuge in Germany. On their return to England, during the reign of Elizabeth, the conflict was resumed. She would not tolerate their notions, but punished all who refused to obey the Episcopal orders.

The Puritans — for so they were called — claimed that the liturgy, ceremonies, and discipline of the Church of England required further reformation; that it was not sufficiently distinct from the Roman Church; that the Church should follow the true word of God, and not tradition or the will of man. Some were contented with a moderate reform, others wished to abolish Episcopacy altogether, and substitute Presbyterianism; while the third party — or Independents — were out-and-out Dissenters, opposed alike to Presbyterianism and Episcopacy. Their persecution led many of this latter class to oppose both Church and King, for the sake of their national liberties.

Hume defines three kinds of Puritans: First, the political Puritans, who disliked the bishops, not so much on ecclesiastical grounds as on account of their servility to the king, and their priestly antipathy to civil liberty. Second, the Puritans in Church discipline, who were for the most part in favor of Presbyterianism. Third, the doctrinal Puritans, or Independents, who were strong Calvinists on Predestination, free will, grace, etc., but were not opposed to

Episcopacy, or the ecclesiastical authority of the monarch; and, rather anomalously, admitted the Arminianism that was ever encouraged at court. The second class was most numerous, at least among the clergy.

The restoration of 1660 brought back Episcopacy and the act of uniformity of 1662, and threw the Puritans into the position of Dissenters. The persecutions they received as such, and their desire for liberty and peace, led many to emigrate to America, where the evil as well as the good of Puritanism expressed itself.

The Puritans were a class of people whose minds had derived a peculiar character from daily contemplation of the Supreme Being and their eternal interests. They were, perhaps, the most remarkable people the world has ever produced. Recognizing no superiority but that of God's favor, and confident of that favor, they despised all worldly accomplishments and dignities. The intensity of their feelings on one subject made them indifferent to many others. In spite of their religious fervor, however, it will be seen, by the following, that they proved as intolerant as their brethren of the Established Church. They interdicted, under heavy penalties, the Book of Common Prayer, not only in churches but in private houses, considering it a crime for even a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians.

Severe punishments were pronounced against such as should presume to blame the Calvinistic mode of worship. Clergymen of respectable character were

not only ejected from their benefices by thousands, but were frequently exposed to the outrages of a fanatical rabble. Churches and sepulchres, fine works of art, and curious remains of antiquity, were brutally defaced. The Parliament resolved that all pictures in the royal collection which contained representations of Jesus or the Virgin Mary should be burned. Sculpture shared the fate of paintings. Nymphs and graces, the work of Ionian chisels, were delivered over to the Puritan stonecutters to be made decent. Sharp laws were passed against betting. It was also enacted that adultery should be punished with death.

Against the lighter passions the ruling faction waged war with a zeal little tempered with humanity or common sense. One ordinance directed that all maypoles in England should be forthwith hewn down. Another proscribed all theatrical diversions. The playhouses were to be dismantled, the spectators fined, and the actors whipped at the cart's tail.

The Long Parliament gave orders, in 1664, that the 25th of December should be strictly observed as a fast, and that all men should pass it in humility, bemoaning the great national sins of romping under the mistletoe, eating boar's head, and drinking ale flavored with roasted apples.

No public act at that time seems to have irritated the common people more than this; for, on the next anniversary of the festival, formidable riots broke out in many places. The constables were resisted, the magistrates insulted, the houses of noted zealots attacked, and the proscribed services of the day openly read in the churches.

It is also to be noticed, that, during the civil

struggles, several sects had sprung into existence, whose eccentricities surpassed anything before seen in England. What were then considered real signs of goodness were the sad-colored dress, the sour look, the straight hair, the nasal whine, the speech interspersed with quaint texts.

The violent prelates, who were, to a man, zealous for prerogative, and the violent Protestants, who were, to a man, zealous for the principles of Parliament, regarded each other with animosity more intense than that which, in the preceding generation, had existed between Catholics and Protestants.

Charles I., like his father, was a zealous Episcopalian, and although not a zealous Arminian, liked a Papist better than a Puritan. Charles ratified, in a solemn manner, that celebrated law which is known by the name of the "Petition of Rights," and which is the second great charter of the liberties of England. By ratifying that law he bound himself never again to raise money without the consent of Parliament, nor again to imprison a person except in due course of law, and never again to subject his people to the jurisdiction of the courts martial.

In no part of Europe had the Calvinistic doctrine and discipline taken so strong a hold on the public mind as in England. In Scotland, a coalition was formed between the Royalists and a large body of the Presbyterians, who regarded the doctrines of the Independents with detestation. Those elements of force which, when the civil war broke out, had appeared arrayed against each other, were combined against Cromwell — all the Calvinists, the great majority of the Roundheads, the Anglican Church, the

Presbyterian Church, the Roman Catholic Church, of England, Ireland, and Scotland. Yet such was his genius and resolution that he was able to overpower and crush everything that stood in his path, making his rule over the country more absolute than that of any of her legitimate kings, and making England more dreaded and respected than she had been under any of these.

The Presbyterian party, powerful both in numbers and in wealth, had been at deadly enmity with the Protector, but was now disposed to regard him with favor. It seemed that the Independents were to be subjected to the Presbyterians, and the men of the sword to the men of the gown. The political feud was, as usual, aggravated by a religious feud.

In Germany the Protestants entered into a conference called the Evangelical Union, supported by England, Holland, and France, and were opposed by the Catholic League. This religious war lasted thirty years; and after all parties had exhausted their resources, and after Germany had been deluged with the blood of Spaniards, Hollanders, Frenchmen, and Swedes, besides that of her own sons, the Treaty of Westphalia was concluded, by which the religious liberties of the Lutherans and Calvinists were guaranteed.

CHAPTER XV.

THE PILGRIMS.

On December 20, 1620, about one hundred immigrants landed at Plymouth, Massachusetts. They were Puritans, who, leaving England to escape persecution, went to Holland, where they remained for a time, and then embarked for America to find in the new world that religious liberty which had been denied them in the old. Keenly feeling the injustice of the persecution they had received in their native land, and driven out upon the world to struggle with the elements for existence, their simple trust and reliance upon an overruling Providence gave them courage, as they landed "on a stern and rock-bound coast"—a vast wilderness before them, and the broad ocean separating them from the land of their birth:

They were a stern, determined people. All the hardships they had experienced only made them more resolute to fight on and fight out the battle of life in the new world of the west. This very struggle made them men of iron.

The history of the Puritan Pilgrims is made up of the hardships that are ever met by the first settlers of a new country. Not only had they these to contend with, but while pestilence and famine were in their houses, upon the outside they were surrounded by hostile savages.

Wherever, in the history of our country, as it has steadily marched forward in the line of progress, are recorded the names of those who have taken a leading part in its general welfare — in the organization and settlement of new States; in the cause of education; in the political arena; in time of peace, in time of war — among these are to be found the names of men, descendants of these Pilgrim Fathers, to whom every American can point with pride. That which in the ancestors was a fault has become an element of strength in their descendants.

That school of intolerance in which the Pilgrim Fathers were educated made them apt scholars; and the very persecutions from which they fled were inflicted by them upon others as soon as *they* held the political power.

As examples of the injustice and intolerance shown all others holding religious views differing from their own, we give the following. One of the men most unjustly persecuted by them was Roger Williams. He had been a clergyman in the Church of England, and became a Puritan in belief. To escape persecution by the Church of England he fled to America, to seek here what was denied him at home — freedom to worship God. On his arrival in Boston, in 1631, he soon found himself in collision with the churches, for they still carried out the principles of which they had been the victims at home. He became a Puritan of the extreme wing, and of that section of the wing whose tendencies were toward the views of the Baptists. He incurred the hostility of the authorities of Boston by disputing the right of the magistrates to punish for any but civil offenses.

One of the charges alleged against Williams was that, on his application to join the congregation at Boston, he refused to first make a public declaration that he repented having sat at communion in the Church of England before coming to America. Among the reasons given by him for leaving the Church of England was this — that it claimed authority over the conscience, and was guilty of persecution; and, in his view, the Protestant brethren of Boston were chargeable with inconsistencies. This was assailing the theocracy which the Puritans were rearing on the shores of New England.

Williams was arrested, and the Court banished him from the colony, ordering him to depart in six weeks. The charge upon which he was convicted was that he had called in question the right of the king to appropriate land belonging to the Indians without purchasing it from them. The second charge was that he had denied the right of the civil power to impose faith and worship. On the second charge the Court received the *advice* of ministers of the Gospel, who informed the Court that denying the magistrates' legal authority in restraining a church from heresy amounted to apostasy, and could not be tolerated. Learning that they were intending to send him to England, he fled into the wilderness, and took refuge with the Indians. Afterwards he founded a settlement, and, intending it as a place of shelter for persons fleeing from religious persecution, he called it Providence.

The history of Roger Williams for the succeeding half century forms a chapter in the history of Puritanism and of the State of Rhode Island.

Anna Hutchinson, while living in England, became interested in the preaching of John Calvin. She and her husband became Puritans, and went to New England in 1634. She was admitted a member of the orthodox church, and rapidly acquired an influence over it. She instituted meetings of the women of her church to discuss sermons and doctrines. She claimed that the Holy Ghost dwelt in every believer, and that the inward relations of the Spirit—the conscious judgment of the mind—are of paramount authority. Two years after her arrival the strife of her supporters and her opponents broke out into public action. Among her patrons was Van Cotton and the whole Boston church, with the exception of four or five persons, while the country clergy were generally against her.

This dispute, says Bancroft, infused its spirit into everything. It interfered with the levy of the troops for the Pequod war; it influenced the respect shown the magistrates, the distribution of the town lots, and assessment of rates; and, at last, the continued existence of the two opposing parties was considered inconsistent with the public peace.

The peculiar tenets of Mrs. Hutchinson were among the eighty-two opinions condemned by an ecclesiastical synod. She was tried and sentenced, with some of her associates, among them Sir Henry Vane, an English statesman, who had joined the Puritans, and, a year after his arrival, was made Governor of the Massachusetts colony. He defended the principles of civil and religious liberty, and objected to the attacks on Mrs. Hutchinson, for many of her opinions he had adopted.

In order to put down the Hutchinsons, a law was passed that no stranger should be received within the jurisdiction of the Colony except by permission of a magistrate.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE REVOLUTION.

The beginning of separate government in America was as early as 1619, when the London Company received an amended charter and constitution for the government of the Colony of Virginia (then extending south to Cape Fear), which allowed the people to elect a House of Burgesses.

In the same year a Dutch man-of-war entered the James River, and sold twenty Africans to the planters, thus introducing slavery into the colonies contemporary with the first step toward a government by the people.

In 1649 the Assembly of the Colony of Maryland passed the memorable act by which Christians of all sects were secured in their public professions of their faith, and allowed to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. This act, which was more tolerant than any act of the Puritans or other Protestants since their arrival on this continent, was passed by the Roman Catholics who settled the Colony of Maryland under the charter granted Lord Baltimore.

By the laws of the Colony of Virginia it was provided that in every settlement there should be a house for the worship of God, and that absence from church

should be punished. Traveling or shooting on the Sabbath was prohibited. There were similar laws in Carolina and Pennsylvania, as well as acts against all stage plays, the playing of cards or dice, May games, and masquerade balls. In New England similar laws prevailed, but more strict, as, in addition to the laws in other colonies, they had sumptuary laws regulating expenses in living; also laws regulating the use of tobacco.

The spirit of political freedom, however, was thoroughly developed among the Calvinists of the colony; republican ideas and feelings, transmitted from the period of the Commonwealth of England, were widely diffused; and, at the same time, there existed for the mother country a warm attachment and devoted loyalty to the crown.

In many respects the connection of the colonies to England was rigorous and for her selfish benefit. The tradesmen and the manufacturers were systematically restrained. Though these oppressive enactments were felt by the colonists, they made no resistance so long as the imperial authority confined itself to measures which, however harsh or injurious, were not clearly unconstitutional.

In 1761 Parliament authorized writs of assistance, or general search-warrants, to search for goods subject to a duty not paid. This caused great excitement in Massachusetts. In Virginia, at about this time, there was a collision between England and that colony on the subject of dues to the clergy. In 1765 the people of the colonies were taxed directly, in spite of all their remonstrances. Then it was that the odious Stamp Act was passed; and, to enforce this act, Par-

liament authorized the quartering of troops upon the colonists, who were required to furnish for them quarters, fuel, cider, *rum*, and "*other necessaries.*"

Associations calling themselves "Sons of Liberty" were organized for the general defense of the rights of the colonies. A congress of delegates from nine colonies convened in New York, where was drawn up a Declaration of Rights, with a memorial to Parliament and a petition to the king, in which the right of England to tax them without representation was denied. These proceedings were all approved by the assemblies of the various colonies. The tax was afterward removed, except that upon tea, which was retained by the express command of the king, who said there should always be one tax at least, to keep up the right of taxation. It was in December, 1773, that the authority of the mother country was openly defied, and tea thrown overboard from ships in Boston harbor.

At the Continental Congress, in session at Philadelphia, Patrick Henry expressed the general feeling of the people in the different colonies when he said, "I am no longer a Virginian, but an American!" At Lexington, on the 19th of April, 1775, was spilled the first blood for political liberty in America.

On the 7th of June, 1776, Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, offered a resolution in Congress, declaring that "the United Colonies are, and ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown; and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved." Upon this there was drawn up and issued the Dec-

laration of Independence, in which it was declared, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. * * * And for the support of this declaration * * * we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The war of the Revolution terminated on the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, October 19, 1781, but it was not until September 3, 1783, that a treaty of peace was signed, by which the United States of America were acknowledged to be free, sovereign, and independent. It was then that the people exercised one of their natural rights — the right to self-government. As usual, there were two political parties: the Federalists, or those who were in favor of the Constitution just as it was, and the Republicans (who afterward took the name of Democrats), who desired to introduce amendments to limit the federal power, and to increase that of the several States and of the people.

The main events to which we wish to refer hereafter occurred during the administration of President Monroe — the Missouri controversy — by which the country was divided on the question of negro slavery. In 1820 the agitation became great; and it was Pennsylvania, who, through her legislature, boldly sent forth the proclamation, containing a truth which had long been suppressed, and giving human slavery its right character: "We refuse to covenant with crime."

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

In founding this church, the fundamental principle, avowed from first to last, was that, besides retaining the ministry and the creed of the primitive church, its authority in all points of doctrine and discipline must be accepted. In this view, the offices of devotion were expurgated of what were deemed errors and innovations, translated from the Latin into the English, and brought together as a Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments. The Thirty-nine Articles summarized the views of the Church of England in regard to her position, and her refusal to submit to the corruptions and assumptions of Rome. In the formation of this church a middle course was taken. While the Roman Catholic form of prayer was copied, it was translated into English, and all the members of the congregation were invited to join their voices with that of the minister. Denying in every part of the system the doctrine of transubstantiation, and regarding as idolatrous all adoration paid to the sacramental bread and wine, she yet —to the disgrace of the Puritans—required her children to receive the memorials of divine love, meekly kneeling; and, while discarding many rich vestments which surrounded the altars of the ancient faith, she

yet retained, to the horror of weak minds, a robe of whiteness, typical of the mystical spouse of Christ.

Nothing, however, so strongly distinguished the Church of England as the relation in which she stood to the monarch. The king was her head. The king was made the pope of his kingdom, the vicar of God, the exponent of Catholic unity, the channel of sacramental grace. He arrogated to himself the right of deciding dogmatically what was orthodox doctrine and what was heresy, of imposing any confession of faith, and of giving religious instruction to his people.

It was in the Parliament of 1601 that the opposition which had, during forty years, been silently gathering and husbanding strength, fought the first great battle and won its first victory. The ground was well chosen. The queen took upon herself to grant patents of monopoly by the score, which caused the House of Commons to meet in an angry and determined mood. The language of the discontented party, high and menacing, was echoed by the voice of the whole nation. The coach of the chief ministers of the crown was surrounded by an indignant populace, who cursed monopolies, and exclaimed that the prerogative should not be suffered to touch the old liberties of England.

Scotland was Protestant. In no part of Europe had the movement of the popular mind against the Roman Catholic Church been so rapid and violent. The reformers had vanquished, deposed, and imprisoned their idolized sovereign. They would not live under such a compromise as had been effected in England. They had established the Calvinistic

doctrines, discipline, and worship; and they made little distinction between prelacy and papacy, between the mass and common prayer. It is a most significant circumstance that no large society of which the tongue is not Teutonic has ever turned Protestant, and that wherever a language derived from that of Rome is spoken the religion of modern Rome to this day prevails. No translation of the Bible has ever been put forth in the Irish language.

The controversies which had divided the political parties in their infancy had related almost exclusively to church government and ceremonies. There had been no serious quarrels between the contending parties on the point of metaphysical theology. The doctrines held by the chiefs of the hierarchy touched original sin, grace, predestination, and election—those which are properly called Calvinistic.

Toward the close of Elizabeth's reign her private prelate, Archbishop Whitgift, drew up, in concert with the bishops of London and other theologians, the celebrated instrument known by the name of the Lambeth Articles. In that instrument the most startling Calvinistic doctrines are affirmed with a directness that would shock many who in our age consider themselves Calvinists.

When the Arminian controversy arose in Holland, the English Government and the English Church lent strong support to the Catholic party; nor is the English name altogether free from stain which has been left on that party by the imprisonment of the Gnostics. But even before the meeting of the Dutch Synod the Anglican clergy were particularly hostile to the Calvinistic worship, had begun to regard with dislike the

Calvinistic metaphysics, and their feelings were very naturally strengthened by the gross injustice, insolence, and cruelty of the party which was predominant at Dort.

The king's object was to do in England all, and more than all, that Richelieu was doing in France to make Charles as absolute a monarch as any on the continent; to put the State and personal liberty of the people at the disposal of the crown; and to deprive the courts of law of all independent authority. The jails were filled with papists. London had the aspect of a city in a state of siege. Catholic members of the House of Lords were excluded from their seats.

The man who took the chief part in settling what *should be* the doctrines of the Anglican Church was Archbishop Cranmer. He was the representative of both the parties which at the time needed each other's assistance. He was at once a divine and a courtier. In his character as a divine he was ready to go in the way of change as far as any Swiss or Scottish reformer.

The Church of Rome held that Episcopacy was a divine institution that contained supernatural grace of a high order, transmitted by the imposition of hands through fifty generations, from the eleven who received their commission on the Galilean mount to the bishops who met at Trent.

The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course, and compromised with the Catholics and the Protestants. In short, they manufactured their religious dogmas, just as the Catholics had done; just as Mahomet had done; and just as Joseph Smith had

done in our day—to meet the necessities of the times, and to protect their own interests.

In organizing the first Christian church on earth, how was it learned that the one placed in the papal chair *was* the vicegerent of God? How was it known in what particular person all the spiritual power of the Son of God was vested to authorize him to take the papal chair as the infallible Pope of Rome?

King Henry VIII., desiring to be this vicegerent of God, and to be invested with all the spiritual powers of Christ, had only to direct Cranmer to make it so, and presto change! the pope is no longer vicegerent in England and Scotland, and Ireland is left in doubt.

How evident it appears that *all* these dogmas are manufactured by men, and that the most unreasonable one—original sin—is really the mother of the whole brood. Take that out of the system, and all the rest will vanish of themselves.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF AMERICA.

Soon after the persecution, by the Puritans, of those differing from them in their religious tenets, numerous sects holding peculiar views upon many disputed doctrinal points arose throughout the length and breadth of this fair land, receiving from the increasing inhabitants additions to their numbers, until, at the present time, the Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Universalists, Unitarians, and others, number many thousands. That the reader may see the difference of doctrinal thought separating these religious bodies we will give a brief sketch of several sects.

The American Presbyterians began their organization about 1700, and are the offspring of the Church of Scotland. The doctrines of the Church are Calvinistic. The only fundamental principle which distinguishes it from the churches of similar belief is this: that God has authorized the government of his Church by presbyters, or elders, who are chosen by the congregation and ordained by predecessors in office, in virtue of the commission which Christ gave his apostles and ministers in the kingdom of God; and that among all the presbyters there is an official party, whatever disparity may exist in their talents or official employments.

Most of the first settlers of New England were

Congregationalists, and established the government of individuals by the male communicating members of the church to which they belonged, and by congregations of sister congregations meeting by representation in ecclesiastical councils.

The Cumberland Presbyterians occupy a middle ground between the Calvinists and Arminians. They reject the doctrine of eternal reprobation, and hold the universality of redemption, and that the spirit of God operates on the will, as Christ has made the atonement in such a manner as to leave all men inexcusable.

The Episcopal Methodists are followers of John Wesley, whose creed was Arminian, and therefore differed from Calvinism in regard to predestination, election, and the extent of the atonement, which, he maintained, was for all men.

The Whitfield Methodists are followers of George Whitfield, who was once a powerful supporter of Calvinism, and is said to have crossed the Atlantic thirteen times in the interest of the Calvinistic dogmas. These dogmas caused much discussion in this church. Wesley, in speaking of Calvinism, said: "By it one part of mankind is irreparably saved, and the rest irreparably damned, it being impossible that any of the latter can be saved. It renders all preaching vain, and tends to destroy holiness and goodness. It represents God as a tyrant and dissembler, by saying one thing and meaning another; of pretending a love for man that he could not love. Predestination is a horrible dream, and represents God as worse than the devil, for the devil can only tempt man to sin, but God forces him to sin." Wesley dared to speak

boldly against a dogma that did not belong to *his* church, but had any one intimated that it was quite as unreasonable for God to damn us for a sin we never committed, he would have denounced such a person as a heretic who deserved burning.

The Protestant Methodists hold the Wesleyan doctrine, but reject Episcopacy. Some of the Baptists entertain Calvinistic and others Arminian doctrines. The Six-Principle Baptists are those who consider that the imposition of hands subsequent to baptism, and generally on the admission of candidates into the church, is an indispensable prerequisite for church-membership and communion.

The Mennonites believe that practical piety is the essence of religion, and that the surest mark of the *true* church is in the sanctity of its members.

The Dunkers lament the fall of Adam, but deny the imputation of his sin to posterity. They believe in dipping three times; and anything less in baptism would be hazardous.

The Universalists believe that if Christ died for *all* men, the Scripture means what it says, and not something else — unreasonable, ungodlike, and vindictive.

In this short note made of the principal and leading churches in America, any one can see that the unreasonable and monstrous dogma of original sin never had any foundation in fact, though it lies at the foundation of all religions; and that while its harshness may be softened or entirely hidden from view, it still remains as the original ancestor of all the dogmas that have caused so much strife and contention.

CHAPTER XIX.

SLAVERY.

It is to slavery, that dark blot which for many years marred the face of the "land of the free," that we now call your attention. Much has America boasted of her freedom, both political and religious. That a portion of her inhabitants have, after a long and fearful struggle, been given equal rights with their white brethren in the affairs of the country, we are now, with happiness, able to affirm. Of the larger number who have not, as yet, attained political liberty, we would speak hereafter; as also of that still larger number who are not, by the laws of this "free country," allowed such religious freedom of thought and expression as should belong to every human being possessing reason and the ability to use it in the questions of life.

When Jefferson, in drafting the immortal Declaration of Independence, embodied in its preamble a formula—the emphatic assertion of the individual right of man—he set forth a proposition new and startling to Europeans, but which dogma and political doctrine had been deeply ingrained with the American heart. It was the embodiment of our forefathers' most deep and sacred convictions. In the

original draft there was the following clause against slavery. It was one of the counts in the indictment against George III., but was stricken out in compliance with the earnest request of Georgia and South Carolina:—

"Determined to keep open a market where men should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative by suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished dye, he is now exciting these very people to rise in arms among us, and purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them by murdering the people on whom he also obtruded them; thus paying off former crimes committed against the liberties of one people with crimes which he urges them to commit against the lives of another."

Edward Everett was once compelled, in Congress, to admit the humiliating fact that slavery was sanctioned by religion; whereupon John Randolph made one of his usual caustic remarks in reply to it: "Sir, I envy neither the head nor the heart of the man from the North who rises here to defend slavery upon principle."

Mr. C. C. Camberlong was no less pointed in his reference to the same remark of Everett. He said: "The gentleman from Massachusetts has gone too far. He has expressed opinions which ought not to escape admonition. I heard them with great surprise and regret. I was astonished to hear him declare that slavery — domestic slavery — say what you will, is a condition of life, as well as any other, to be justified by morality, religion, and international law."

In looking up the position of the churches in regard to slavery, we have found that no one of the religious denominations can show so fair a record in this matter as the Quakers. Slaveholding by the Roman Catholics and Protestant Episcopalians has never been and is not yet considered inconsistent with piety and an exemplary Christian life. The Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, and kindred orthodox denominations, have no very luminous record upon this subject. While the Presbyterian Church was divided by Mason and Dixon's line, it was, with a few spasmodic exceptions, always apologizing for slavery, and oftener took the part of determined assailants than of doing anything to hasten abolition, having already solemnly pronounced slavery a requirement of Christianity.

After the great struggle of the Rebellion was over, and all the slaves in our land were declared free, then these same Presbyterians of the old and new school met and gravely resolved that the question of human slavery should no longer divide the chosen and elect people of God. It was then that the northern faction humbly confessed the truth for the first time, admitting that it had been with them a matter of policy, not piety — cotton, not Christ — that had influenced them when they defended what they always knew to be an unchristian and barbarous institution.

The Southern faction were willing to accept the situation, which they regretted, and insisted that, as true Christians, they had only taken the inspired Word of God as their authority, in which they had found that slavery was not only permitted but justified. Thus the great breach was healed, and the

elect of God redoubled their efforts to Christianize the world by sending the Holy Bible into Africa, having been unfortunate in Christianizing that race after bringing them to the free land of America.

The Methodists had a similar division in their church. Their General Conference which met in Cincinnati in 1836, solemnly and piously disclaimed any wish, intention, or right, to interfere with the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it then existed in the slaveholding States of the Union. They condemned two pious ministers who had delivered abolitionist lectures, declaring the opponents of abolition to be the true Christians, and true friends of the church, of the slaves of the South, and of the Constitution of our free country.

The regular Baptists have a record as disgraceful to the Christian religion as either the Presbyterians or Methodists. The Freewill Baptists, however, and several bodies of the Scotch Covenanters, as well as some Methodist dissenters, and offshoots from the original Presbyterian stock, have generally stood up like true followers of Christ, and maintained an attitude of hostility to slavery in every form.

Had the Declaration of Independence retained the clause that was stricken out, it would have been a more consistent instrument. This, and the Constitution which followed, was drawn up in the same way as the Articles of Faith of the Church of England.

As Cranmer compromised with the papacy, so Jefferson compromised with slavery, and the compromise with slavery being "a covenant with crime," remained a festering sore in the body politic, even as

the compromise with papacy remained a festering sore eating away the very vitals of the Christian religion.

The effect of slavery has ever been to make the masters cruel and despotic, setting up their conscience as supreme authority over the mind, body, and soul of the slave. Wherever and whenever they could wield sufficient power they have never failed to exercise it, not alone upon the negroes, but upon any one whom they supposed to be endeavoring to wrest from them their power. To become convinced of this, we have only to glance back a few years to the records of Congress, the speeches and letters and newspapers of that day, to find them overflowing with menaces and threats against all who dared to allude to the great and fundamental principle that "all men are created free and equal." This desire to hang all who favored freedom — that freedom of which our forefathers boasted in the Declaration of Independence— was not confined to a few individuals or editors of the South, but was shared by nearly all its citizens, as is clearly expressed through their legislative bodies.

The "New Orleans True American" said: "We can assure the Bostonians, and all others who have embarked in the nefarious scheme of abolishing slavery at the South, that lashes will hereafter be spared the backs of their emissaries. Let them send out their men to Louisiana. They will never return to tell their sufferings; but they shall expiate the crime of interfering with our domestic institutions by being burned at the stake."

A United States Senator from South Carolina said in the Senate: "Let an abolitionist come within the

borders of South Carolina, and if we can catch him we will try him, and notwithstanding the interference of all the governments on earth, we will hang him."

Selecting these two specimens from a wilderness of them, is like entering a dense forest in autumn and picking out a few blood-red leaves here and there, at random, as sad mementoes of that "lost cause."

Despite the disrepute in which abolitionists were held, these faithful workers never relinquished the cause until the South was brought to a settlement of this question in a deadly struggle, deluging the Southern soil with the blood of the sons of both North and South.

Having seen that the colored race in America have gained in law, if not in fact, their political rights as American citizens, we now call your attention to that still larger number remaining as yet disfranchised. We refer to the women of America. Over this much-disputed subject — a subject which to many is an odious one, but undeservedly so — there is yet to be a mighty struggle. We cannot leave this subject of slavery without calling the attention of the reader to the injustice done to the women of our country.

We can proudly and honestly affirm that the women of America stand, in point of culture and intellectual attainments, far in advance of the women of any other country. Is it right, we ask, that women — with reason and power of thought equal to those of men, when given equal advantages — should be held as inadequate to grapple with the questions of political government? As a mooted question of the nineteenth century, this takes a foremost place in the minds of thinking men and women.

It is upon the third picture in the gallery of human slavery in America that we now ask you to turn your gaze. It is composed of a larger number than has composed the preceding ones, being made up of thousands of men, women, and children, the abject slaves of a power more despotic and far-reaching in its effects than any political power. We refer to the slaves of the Church of Rome. Steadily advancing, and reaching out in all directions for more and greater acquisitions to its already overwhelming numbers, this church will, if not speedily attacked and shorn of its strength, bring us all, by that continued series of stratagems and cunning by which she has ever been distinguished, into a servitude as degrading as that of the African slave.

CHAPTER XX.

THE CAUSE FOUND.

As has been heretofore stated, we have no more feeling of animosity, or even prejudice, against the Church of Rome than against its offspring. All that we have herein stated relating to this church is that which we have been forced to point out while searching in the history of the past for the cause of the struggle which, for so many centuries, has been raging throughout Christendom.

We have found, at last, the religious dogmas in relation to which all this strife and contention originated; and have found that each and all of them issued out of this church. We have found, by the records, that these dogmas were established by different Œcumenical Councils, which decreed, in the year 325, that Christ was God; in the year 381, the existence of the Holy Ghost, proceeding from God and the Son; in the year 450, that Christ was both human and divine, but which decree it was found necessary to change; in the year 1115, the dogma of transubstantiation (the Council of Trent, called to settle the disputed dogma, lasting 18 years); in the year 1854, the immaculate conception of Mary (in relation to

which there was a contest for 714 years before it was settled, and decreed as a dogma); in the year 1870, the infallibility of the pope.

Here, we claim, can be found the cause of the religious struggle which has lasted for eighteen centuries, and is still going on.

As the great upas-tree, with its many spreading branches, bears a nourishing bread-fruit, white as snow, and also exudes a resinous gum which taints the atmosphere, and when taken into the system is a deadly poison, so the Church of Rome, with its many spreading branches, upon being engrafted with scions of moral principles, has, to all appearances, borne a nourishing fruit; but the church itself, having been built upon an error, exudes a deadly poison, tainting the atmosphere, and leaving, down the centuries of religious strife, a bloody trail of fifty millions of human lives.

Therefore we are led to say, that, once let the roots of this tree be laid bare to the open sunlight of truth, they will be destroyed forever, and all its branches will be left to wither and die.

We adopt the words of Draper, when we say that no one who is acquainted with the present line of thought in Christendom can deny the fact that an intellectual and religious crisis is impending. In all directions we see the lowering skies and hear the mutterings of the coming storm.

The Roman Catholics have to encounter these formidable ideas of the conservation and correlation of force; the doctrine of evolution and development, which strike at the root of the old doctrines of suc-

cessive creation; the former resting in the fundamental principle that the quantity of force in the universe is invariable, though the forms under which force expresses itself may be transmutable into others. It is at this time that the great theory of emanation and absorption is seen to be in harmony with this great idea.

Whatever may be the preparatory incidents to the great and impending crisis which Christendom must soon witness, of this we may rest assured—that the silent secession from the popular faith will find at length political expression.

From the foregoing brief summary of historical facts we formulate the following charges against the Church of Rome:—

That she has feloniously, wilfully, and with malice aforethought, caused the death of fifty million human beings.

That she has wilfully and corruptly, with intent to deceive, defrauded the people by forging and uttering religious dogmas that have inflicted great injury upon the people, in this:—

That she has enslaved the mind, repressed freedom of thought, resisted the march of progress, delayed and interfered with the work of science, and has sought to make the human race her abject slaves.

That she has made herself the "*Octopus vulgaris*" of the human race, by lying among the "seven hills" and reaching out her papal arms in all directions into every land and every isle of the sea, and, clasping her tentacles around every living thing, has been sucking

the life-blood from them for eighteen centuries, and her hungry maw is still unsatisfied.

There is yet another struggle to come — a struggle which, in the great march of human progress, has ever been keeping pace with that of political liberty. It is one that we believe will be more bitter, if not more deadly, than the other — the struggle for religious liberty in this country. It is the struggle that has been going on for eighteen centuries; but, like all contests between that which is right and true and that which is wrong and false, the right and true *must* at last prevail. While wrong and error may for centuries stubbornly contest the onward march of universal progress, and may many times appear to be on the verge of a triumph, yet that triumph never comes.

In this grand march, France and America have stepped into the van of the column and erected the statue of "Liberty Enlightening the World," and when she is crowned, as she will be, with her rightful cap, then, and not until then, will her torch, held aloft, give glad welcome to those who approach our shore in search of religious as well as political liberty.

This will be the triumph at the close of this great struggle; a triumph for which many anxious, weary souls, are looking and longing; a triumph that will be celebrated on the other shore of life by the fifty millions of martyrs who suffered and died for religious liberty; a glorious triumph which we believe is not far distant.

Even now some one may be preparing the fuse

down which the glowing spark will reach and explode that vast old mine of superstition, filled with musty relics of the bones, skulls, vestments, and inspired tomes of a countless number of earthly saints; the rusty chains and instruments of torture stained with the blood of martyrs;—all deeply covered in the accumulated dust of barbarous ages. This explosion will, we believe, be the death of dogmatic religion.

INDEX.

THE TRUTH SEEKER. Leading Journal of Freethought and Reform. Largest, Cheapest, Best. The Enemy of Superstition; the Friend of Humanity. E. M. Macdonald, Editor. C. P. Somerby, Business Manager. Weekly, Illustrated, Folio, 16 pages. Yearly, $3; Four months, $1. Sample Copies, Circulars, and Club Terms, FREE.

Paine's Great Political and Theological Works. With Portrait and Life. 1 vol., Octavo, 800 pp. Cloth, $3; leather, $4; morocco, g.e., $4.50. Or, in 2 vols.: Vol. I. POLITICAL WORKS: "Common Sense," "Crisis," "Rights of Man." Cloth, $1.50. Vol. II. THEOLOGICAL WORKS: "Age of Reason," "Examination of Prophecies," etc., with Life of Paine and Steel Portrait. Cloth, $1.50. AGE OF REASON. Paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c. AGE OF REASON AND EXAMINATION OF PROPHECIES. Pap., 40c.; clo., 75c. RIGHTS OF MAN. Answer to Burke's Attack on French Revolution. Pap., 40c.; clo., 75c. CRISIS. Written during American Revolution. Pap., 40c.; Clo., 75c.

Supernatural Religion. An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation. (Said to be written by W. K. Clifford, F. R. S.) The most thorough and exhaustive work on the claims of Supernaturalism ever written. Complete in 1 vol., 8vo., 1115pp. Cloth, $4; leather, $5; morocco, g.e., $5.50.

An Analysis of Religious Belief. An Examination of the Creeds, Rites, and Sacred Writings of the World. By Viscount Amberley. Complete, from London Edition, in 1 vol., 8vo, 745pp. Clo., $3; leather, $4; morocco, g.e., $4.50.

Nathaniel Vaughan: Priest and Man. By Frederika Macdonald. A Standard Freethought and Labor Reform Novel. 12mo, 404pp. Cloth, $1.25.

The Creed of Christendom. Its Foundation Contrasted with its Superstructure. By W. R. Greg. Complete in 1 vol., 12mo, 399pp. Cloth, $1.50.

The Old Faith and the New. By D. F. Strauss. 2 vols. in 1, 12mo, clo., $1.50.

The Martyrdom of Man. A Compendium of Universal History. By Winwood Reade. Sixth ed. 12mo, 544pp. Cloth, $1.75.

The Order of Creation. The Conflict between Genesis and Geology. A Controversy between the Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Prof. T. H. Huxley, Prof. Max Mueller, M. Reville, E. Lynn Linton. 12mo, 178pp. Pap., 50c.; clo., 75c.

The Reign of the Stoics. Their History, Religion, and Philosophy, and Maxims of Self-Control, Self-Culture, Benevolence, and Justice. By F. M. Holland. 12mo, 248pp. Cloth, $1.25.

Through Rome, On. A Memoir of Christian and Extra-Christian Experience. By N. R. Waters. 12mo, 352pp. Cloth, $1.75.

The Christ of Paul. A Critical Study of the Origins of Christian Doctrines and Canonical Scriptures. By George Reber. 12mo, 400pp. Cloth, $2.

Theology and Mythology. An Inquiry into the Claims of Biblical Inspiration and the Supernatural Element in Religion. By A. H. O'Donoghue. 12mo, 194pp. Cloth, $1.

The Truth-Seeker Annual and Freethinkers' Almanac for 1885. Thirty-nine Portraits of Prominent American Freethinkers, and other Illus., 120pp, 25c. THE SAME for 1886. Thirty Portraits of Distinguished European Freethinkers, Scientists, and Philosophers, and other Illus., 25c.

The Story Hour. For Children and Youth. By Susan H. Wixon. Without Superstition. The only Illustrated Freethinkers' Children's Story-Book ever issued. 66 full-page and 25 smaller Illus. 4to, 224pp., bds., $1.25.

Men, Women, and Gods, and Other Lectures. By Helen H. Gardener. With an Introduction by Robert G. Ingersoll. 12mo, 180pp. Pap., 50c.; clo., $1.

The Brain and the Bible. The Conflict between Mental Science and Theology. By E. C. Beall. Preface by R. G. Ingersoll. 12mo., 290pp. Clo., $1.

THE TRUTH SEEKER CO., 28 Lafayette Place, New York.
Publishers of Freethought and Reform Works.

☞ *Full List of Publications sent free.*

MEN, WOMEN, AND GODS,

AND OTHER LECTURES.

By HELEN H. GARDENER.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

By COL. R. G. INGERSOLL.

Published by The Truth Seeker Company, 33 Clinton Place, New York. Heavy paper, handsomely bound in cloth, $1.00; paper covers, 50 cents.

PRESS NOTICES.

[The Chicago *Times* is one of the most wide-awake and independent newspapers in America. Its daily circulation is 43,000 copies; its Sunday circulation is but a few hundred less than 50,000. The daily edition is never less than ten pages, while its Sunday edition often reaches twenty. Helen H. Gardener may therefore congratulate herself that her book has induced so widely read a journal to give its world an opinion so damaging to the claims of Christianity as the following notice of "Men, Women, and Gods :"]

"Men, Women, and Gods, and Other Lectures," by Helen H. Gardener, is a duodecimo volume of about 186 pages, containing three lectures with an appendix, setting forth some of the authorities from which the lecturer draws some of her material.

The first lecture gives the title to the book, the second is on "Vicarious Atonement," and the third on "Historical Facts and Theological Fictions."

All are keen, vigorous, and acrid attacks on the Christian church forms of theology. They can scarcely be said to be attacks on religion or religious feeling, since the flower of that plant is charity of thought and action, and in this Miss Gardener sees the highest end of man's emotional side, as in absolute freedom of investigation and opinion she sees the highest end of his intellectual side. Her leading purpose seems to be to show that women, of all persons, should least support the Bible and the churches which hold it in reverence.

The first lecture is a surprisingly bitter and scathing denunciation of the Old Testament as the sum of all cruelty and brutality toward women, and she makes up a startlingly strong case from the pages of the book itself. If any one does not think the case can be made strong let him read carefully this book and also the thirty-first chapter of "Numbers."

The second lecture arraigns vicarious atonement as an inexcusable injustice in itself, weakening and corrupting in its influence, like indiscriminate almsgiving, and points out that it is not peculiar to Christianity, but is found in some form in every religious system known in history.

Both these lectures are strong productions, but are disfigured with a good deal of flippant phrasing, designed, no doubt, to catch the popular attention by tickling the popular ear. The lecturer's strongest work is done in the third lecture, where her purpose is to show that our civilization is in no sense based upon Christianity, and that the Christian religion has especially not contributed to the elevation of woman in any respect. Here she drops largely her flippancy of style and settles down to earnest work.

Civilization she holds to be chiefly the creature of environment, the basis of which, in this world, is in climate and soil. In support of her view of the position of woman she quotes largely from Sir Henry Maine, showing among other things that the position of woman in Roman law and usage, before the introduction of Christianity, was in advance of what it is even now in some respects, and that the tendency of the canon (church) law was invariably to force her back into the degradation from which she had been rescued by a long and painful evolution.

In this lecture, too, she answers the questions as to what she would substitute for the sanctions of Christianity, and she takes considerable pains to show, what one would think need scarcely be insisted upon in our day, that the morals of civilization—morals in general, indeed—are not at all based in or dependent upon religion, certainly not on Christianity, since the so-called "golden rule," the highest principle of morality, antedates Christianity a thousand years.

But space fails to more than thus meagerly call attention to this remarkable book. One can only express a regret that its vigor and suggestiveness are weakened by the flippancy of manner alluded to. Its material is quite worthy of being freed from trifling of this kind, *although it must be admitted that there are minds whose attention cannot be so well gained in any other way.*

It is certainly a red-hot book.—*Syracuse Herald.*

This is a cleverly blasphemous book.—*Buffalo Express.*

I am much pleased with the book.—*Matilda Joslyn Gage.*

Her language is epigrammatic, witty, elegant, and pathetically true.—*Banner of Light.*

A breezy and vivacious book. . . . Sparkling and thought-kindling.—*Van Buren Denslow.*

Quite superb ! Has the faculty of getting at the point by short cuts.—*Nonconformist.*

I trust your spirited little volume will find a multitude of readers, and bring you an ample return of gratitude.—*James Parton.*

The author's exposure and condemnation of Bible fiction and theological dogma is thorough and complete."—*Independent Pulpit.*

She writes with a power and plainness of speech that rival Colonel Ingersoll's masterly attacks on the idols of superstition.—*Winsted Press.*

Written in a style that is sprightly and sarcastic. . . . Meets some of the claims of orthodox Christianity quite effectively.—*B. F. Underwood, Boston Index.*

It is a brave and a true little book, and I congratulate you and thank you for writing it. . . . It will be more appreciated in years that are to come.—*Hon. Elizur Wright.*

It is a new departure for a woman to write such a book as this, so well calculated to upset established theories. . . . Well calculated to alarm the faithful sentinels on the walls of Zion.—*R. I. Pendulum.*

Miss Gardener does not abuse the men for women's position, and beg for better treatment. She calls upon the women to dare to think and act for themselves, and to gain the place which rightly belongs to them.—*The Sociologist.*

Her position is that woman, last of all created things, has any right to believe in the inspiration of the Bible or the divine origin of religion. She flings this statement to the breeze, and follows it up with an assortment of rhetorical sockdologers that leave no room to dispute its right to be correct.—*St. Louis Post-Dispatch.*

It abounds in good, solid argument, and on nearly every page glitters with scintillations of wit. . . . She proves herself to be not only an able attorney for her sex, but a brave one, too ; for she does not throw away an effective weapon in the fight because, forsooth, it may be an unpleasant one to handle.—*Hon. A. B. Bradford.*

But the outside of the platter is not where the attraction lies. That is between the covers, on every page sparkling with brilliancy and cutting deep with keen sarcasm and effective wit, with vigorous attacks on sacred things, and unsparing exposure of the weak points in theological dogmas and scriptural inspiration. . . . It is a remarkably brilliant book.—*N. Y. Day Star.*

This, without exception, is one of the most valuable and interesting books that I have read for some time. Miss Gardener has done a noble work, and done it well. . . . It is needless to say that Miss Gardener's style of writing is of the most finished order—light, without being frivolous; humorous, without being offensive, and argumentative, without being wearisome.—*Charles Watts.*

She has acquitted herself splendidly. The work abounds in humor and wit. It would be impossible in a brief notice to do justice to it. . . . I predict for it a permanent place in the literature of Freethought. The frontispiece, although fairly good, does not do justice to the original. The introduction by Colonel Ingersoll is one of his literary gems, and therefore needs no words of praise.—*Prof. W. S. Bell.*

A book that is destined to make its mark. . . . Her wit, keen as Voltaire's is as polished as the sting of a bee; but, instead of poison, it distills the genuine milk of human kindness that heals the wounds it makes.

THE IMAGE BREAKER,

BY JOHN E. REMSBURG.

No. 1. THE DECLINE OF FAITH.
" 2. PROTESTANT INTOLERANCE.
" 3. WASHINGTON AN UNBELIEVER.
No. 4. JEFFERSON AN UNBELIEVER.
" 5. PAINE AND WESLEY.
" 6. THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

TESTIMONIALS.

Brief, cheap, incisive, unanswerable.—*James Parton.*

The language is dignified and the logic sound.—*The Alliance.*

Sharp enough to penetrate through the thickest crust of superstition.—*Hon. Elizur Wright*, Boston.

They will be useful in clearing the way for the better order of things to come.—*T. B. Wakeman*, New York.

The author writes in vigorous style.—*The Index.*

The "Image Breaker" promises to do most effective work.—*Allan Pringle*, Canada.

They are good seed, and humanity will reap from them a priceless harvest.—*Col. John R. Kelso*, California.

His style is very simple, earnest, and attractive. He don't overshoot nor underfire, but hits the central object at a vital point.—*Hon. W. H. Herndon*, Law Partner and Biographer of Abraham Lincoln.

I wish we were wealthy enough to put one into every Christian's post-office box in the world.—*Ella E. Gibson*, Washington, D. C.

Each number contains a brilliant lecture on some popular subject.—*The Universe*, San Francisco.

I like his style much better than Ingersoll's.—*Jeremiah Hacker*, N. J.

An edition of fifteen thousand "Image Breakers" in India has already been exhausted.—*Atchison Globe.*

They should have a wide circulation.—*Judge Arnold Krekel*, Missouri.

His hammer is small, but it strikes effective blows.—*Judge C. B. Waite*, Chicago.

He hammers out one point at a time and finishes it.—*Hon. A. B. Bradford*, Pennsylvania.

Like everything he writes and says, proof is given to substantiate his claims.—*Kansas Blade.*

Perfect gems of Liberal thought.—*J. H. Burnham*, Michigan.

The best ammunition for missionary work.—*The Iron-Clad Age.*

Each one will be found to be an "Image Breaker" or destroyer of theology.—*Boston Investigator.*

Being read at a meeting of our National Secular Society the members expressed themselves in high terms of the works.—*J. E. Brumages*, Portsmouth, England.

The subjects treated are popular. The information they contain is imparted in language plain and forcible, and not seldom with grace and beauty of expression.—*Thomas C. Gray*, Edinburgh, Scotland.

Very creditable, and will bear good fruit.—*Joseph Byrne*, Dublin, Ireland.

Thoroughly logical, clear and vigorous. His style is particularly bright and lucid. Humanity cannot know the extent of the services rendered to it by men like him.—*Edward O'Neil*, Secretary Irish Secular Society.

They are full of terse, trenchant, radical matter, and will open the eyes of every reasonable man.—*Kedarnath Basu*, M.C.A.S., Berhampore, Bengal, India.

Helping to spread the principles of Freethought and check the baneful influence of Christian teachings.—*Indian Mirror.*

John E. Remsburg's "Decline of Faith" has exposed in their face the false assertions of the Christian missionaries.—*N. Mukerji*, India.

Just the works to suit the Freethinkers of Ceylon. I wish their author would take a trip to this portion of the world.—*E. R. Gooneratna*, Mudaliyar of the Governor's Gate, Galle, Ceylon, India

They are valuable contributions to the literature of freedom.—*Charles Bright*, Sydney, Australia.

TRUTH SEEKER CO., 28 Lafayette Place, New York.

WORKS BY PROF. WILLIAM DENTON.

Be Thyself. Price, 10 cents.

Christianity no Finality; or, Spiritualism Superior to Christianity. Price, 10 cents.

Common Sense Thoughts on the Bible. Price, 10 cts.

Garrison in Heaven. A Dream. Price, 10 cents.

Geology: The Past and Future of our Planet. Price, $1.50.

Is Spiritualism True? Price, 10 cents.

Man's True Savior. Price, 10 cents.

Orthodoxy False, since Spiritualism is True. Price, 10 cents.

Radical Discourses on Religious Subjects. Price, $1.25.

Radical Rhymes. Price, $1.25.

Sermon from Shakspere's Text. Price, 10 cents.

Soul of Things; or, Psychometric Researches and Discoveries. In three volumes. Price; $1.50 per volume.

The Deluge in the Light of Modern Science. Price, 10 cents.

The God Proposed for Our National Constitution. Price, 10 cents.

The Irreconcilable Records; or, Genesis and Geology. Cloth, 40 cents; paper, 25 cents.

The Pocasset Tragedy. Price, 10 cents.

What is Right? Price, 10 cents.

What Was He; or, Jesus in the Light of the Nineteenth Century. Price, cloth, $1.25; paper, $1.

Who are Christians? Price, 10 cents.

Who Killed Mary Stannard? Price, 10 cents.

B. F. UNDERWOOD'S WORKS.

Essays and Lectures. Embracing Influence of Christianity on Civilization; Christianity and Materialism; What Liberalism offers in Place of Christianity; Scientific Materialism; Woman; Spiritualism from a Materialistic Standpoint; Paine the Political and Religious Reformer; Materialism and Crime; Will the Coming Man Worship God? Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity; the Authority of the Bible; Freethought Judged by its Fruits; Our Ideas of God. 300 pp., paper, 60 cents; cloth, $1.

Influence of Christianity upon Civilization. 25 cents.

Christianity and Materialism. 15 cents.

What Liberalism Offers in Place of Christianity. 10 cents.

Scientific Materialism: Its Meaning and Tendency. 10 cents.

Spiritualism from a Materialistic Standpoint. 10 cents.

Paine the Political and Religious Reformer. 10 cents.

Woman: Her Past and Present: Her Rights and Wrongs. 10 cents.

Materialism and Crime. 10 cents.

Will the Coming Man Worship God? 10 cents.

Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity. 10 cents.

Twelve Tracts. Scientific and Theological. 20 cents.

Burgess-Underwood Debate. A four day's debate between B. F. Underwood and Prof. O. A. Burgess, President of the Northwestern Christian University, Indianapolis, Ind. Accurately reported. 188 pp. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 80 cents.

Underwood-Marples Debate. A four nights' debate between B. F. Underwood and Rev. John Marples. Fully reported. Paper, 35 cents; cloth, 60 cents.

General Introduction to Social Science. PART I. Introduction to Fourier's Theory of Social Organization. By Albert Brisbane. PART II. Social Destinies. By Charles Fourier. 8vo, 272pp., clo., $1.

Theory of Social Organization. By Charles Fourier. With an Introduction by Albert Brisbane. 12mo, 544pp., clo., $1.50.

Fourier's theory is radically misunderstood by the general public, and no true test of it has ever yet been made in practice. These volumes will do much toward furnishing a knowledge of the man and his teachings—*Critical Review.*

Socialism. A Reply to Roswell D. Hitchcock, D.D. By an Independent Socialist. 12mo, 67pp., pap., 25c; clo., 50c.

He blames Dr. Hitchcock that the latter perceives a huge human misery, but neither sees nor seeks any other solution than that the weakest must go to the wall. It is against this passiveness that "Socialist" cries out. Is there no help for the miserable? he asks. The doctrine that government should merely "protect" he attacks, and insists that it should "assist" also. While he does not believe that "property is robbery," or wholly subscribe to "the world owes me a living," he affirms "the world owes me a chance to make a living."—*N. Y. Herald.*

Nathaniel Vaughan. Priest and Man. By Frederika Macdonald. Standard Freethought and Labor Reform Novel. 3 vols. in 1., 12mo, 404pp., clo., gold side and back stamp, $1.25.

Modern Thinker. (No. 2.) The Most Advanced Speculations in Philosophy, Science, Sociology, and Religion. 8vo, 160pp., pap., 75c.

The Conventional Lies of Our Civilization. By Max Nordau. CONTENTS.—Mene, Tekel, Upharsin; The Religious, Monarchic, and Aristocratic, Political, Economical, Matrimonial, and Miscellaneous Lies; Closing Harmony. 12mo, 364pp., pap., People's edition, 50c.; clo., $1.50

The Imperial Council of Vienna prohibited the sale of this book in Austria, and confiscated all copies of it they could find.

Economic Equities. A Compend of the Natural Laws of Industrial Production and Exchange. By J. K. Ingalls, author of "Social Wealth." Pap., 25c.

Next Step to Progress. Limitation of Wealth. By J. H. Keyser. 20c.

Socialism and Utilitarianism. By J. S. Mill. 12mo, 288pp., clo., $1.

Fruits of Philosophy. A Treatise on the Population Question. By Dr. Chas. Knowlton. Edited by Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant. 25c.

Poverty: Its Cause and Cure. Pointing out the means by which the working classes may raise themselves from their present state of low wages and ceaseless toil to one of comfort, dignity, and independence, and which is also capable of entirely removing, in course of time, the other principal social evils. By M. G. H. 10c.

Large or Small Families? On which Side Lies the Balance of Comfort? By Austin Holyoake. 5c.

Poverty: Its Effects on the Political Condition of the People. By Chas. Bradlaugh. 5c.

Why Do Men Starve? By Charles Bradlaugh. 5c.

The Land Question. Large Estates Inimical to the Welfare of the People. By Chas. Bradlaugh. 5c.

Labor's Prayer. By Chas. Bradlaugh. 5c.

Letters to Young People. By (Prince) Peter Krapotkine. With Life of Author, by Stepniak. 10c.

The Truth Seeker. Leading Journal of Freethought and Reform. Largest, Cheapest, Best. The Enemy of Superstition; the Friend of Humanity. E. M. Macdonald, Editor. C. P. Somerby, Business Manager. Weekly, Illustrated, Folio 16 pages. Yearly, $3; Four months, $1. Sample Copies, Circulars, and Club Terms, FREE.

THE TRUTH SEEKER CO., 28 Lafayette Place, New York.

PAINE'S WORKS.

Paine's Theological Works, including The Age of Reason, Examination of Prophecies, Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, Reply to Mr. Erskine, Letter to Camille Jordan, etc., etc., with a life of Paine and a steel-plate portrait. 12mo. In paper covers, $1; cloth, $1.50.

Paine's Great Works (complete) in one volume. Cloth, $3.00; leather, $4.00; morocco, $4.50.

Paine's Political Works, including Common Sense, The Crisis, and Rights of Man. Cloth, $1.50.

The Age of Reason. An investigation of true and fabulous theology. Without a peer in the world. Paper, 25 cents, or 5 for $1. Cloth, 50 cents.

The Age of Reason and An Examination of the Prophecies. Paper, 40 cents; Cloth, 75 cents.

Common Sense. Paine's first work. 15 cents.

The Crisis. Containing numbers from I. to XVI. inclusive. Paper, 40 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Rights of Man. For the oppressed of humanity. Paper, 40; cloth, 75 cents.

Paine's Life, with Remarks on Comte and Rousseau. By Calvin Blanchard. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

B. F. UNDERWOOD'S WORKS.

Essays and Lectures. Embracing Influence of Christianity on Civilization; Christianity and Materialism; What Liberalism offers in Place of Christianity; Scientific Materialism; Woman; Spiritualism from a Materialistic Standpoint; Paine the Political and Religious Reformer; Materialism and Crime; Will the Coming Man Worship God? Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity; the Authority of the Bible; Freethought Judged by its Fruits; Our Ideas of God. 300 pp., paper, 60 cents; cloth, $1.

Influence of Christianity upon Civilization. 25 cents.

Christianity and Materialism. 15 cents.

ON THE LABOR QUESTION.

Reported for the "Truth Seeker" by
I. N. BAKER,
and Printed by Permission of
the Author.

A LAY SERMON.

BY

Robert G. Ingersoll.

THE ONLY CORRECT
EDITION.

NEW YORK:
THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY.
28 LAFAYETTE PLACE.

PRICE, 5 CENTS.